JKM LIBRARY
BX4817.P967
Colton, Calvin,
Protestant Jesuitism
3 9968 02640 1235

FROM
W. A. LEARY'S
CHEAP BOOK STORE,
No. 158, North Second Street,
corner of New, Philad'a.

ACCESSION NUMBER 19698
SHELF NUMBER BX4817 P967

The Virginia Library
McCormick
Theological Seminary
of the
Presbyterian Church, Chicago.

From the Wurtz Fund.

RECEIVED

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

https://archive.org/details/protestantjesuit0000colt

PROTESTANT JESUITISM.

BY

A PROTESTANT, pseud.

. . . . . : "The priest of superstition rides an ass; the priest of fanaticism—a tiger." . . . . . .

Spiritual Despotism.

McCormick LIBRARY Theological Seminary

NEW-YORK:

HARPER & BROTHERS, CLIFF-ST.

MDCCCXXXVI.

1836

Entered, according to Act of Congress, in the year 1836,
By Harper & Brothers,
In the Clerk's Office of the Southern District of New-York.

BX
4817
P367

PREFACE.

The author is aware it may appear that he has given an undue prominence in this work to the subject of Temperance. It is due to himself to say, that he did not intend to resume it again after it had been dismissed in the early part of the volume; and, moreover, that other matter pertinent to the general topic was arranged, to occupy some minor chapters, which has been superseded by the unexpected demand to notice the doings at Saratoga. Having viewed the Temperance measures as occupying a leading position in that system of Jesuitism which has been set up in this country, and as it has, at last, come to so clear a development of such a design, it seemed to him pertinent, and somewhat important, to make thorough work in exposing it. He would gladly have compressed it to narrower limits for the sake of introducing other matter; but an imperfect exposure seemed worse than none; and he has

therefore thought proper to give it a thorough discussion. It will be conceded by all that he has not given a larger space to it than it occupies in the public mind; and unless he had made a full display of the merits of the question, the position he has felt obliged to take might have seemed feeble, and his reasoning inconclusive. Since, in the opinion of the author, the combined attempt to establish a spiritual supremacy over the mind of this country has made its leading and most forcible demonstration under the guise of a Temperance reformation, it may perhaps seem a sufficient reason that an effort to expose it should bear on that point with a corresponding force. And this is the author's apology for the prominence he has given to that topic.

The object of introducing an argument, in the body of this work, to determine the stability of Christianity, as it stands in the estimation of the public, is to show that there is no necessity or apology for the getting up of these numerous associations, so nearly corresponding with the model of the Jesuitical school, imbodying its principle, and tending to the same results; that there is no exigency in human society to justify such meas

ures; and that it is better and safer to leave Christianity under the operation of its primitive and simple institutions as established by its Divine Author. In the light of this argument it will be apparent that, besides the Jesuitical character and tendency of the measures falling under criticism in these pages, they must necessarily and most seriously embarrass Christianity in its design and operations, and throw insurmountable obstacles in its way, till they are checked and suppressed.

The reader will not be at a loss to make his own applications of the main drift of this work, notwithstanding the author has not found room in these pages to perform this office in the numerous directions which so readily open to the eye of the common observer. It will be impossible not to be struck with the unexampled rapidity with which moral and religious associations have been formed in this country—with the strides they have made to influence and power—and with the likeness which most of them bear, upon examination, to their great prototype. The author might have gone thoroughly into specifications had it been necessary. But, having adduced examples sufficient to expose the principle which has been so

extensively at work, it is easy for every observer to trace its pathway through its multiform and all-pervading ramifications.

It will be observed, that these measures have always been based upon, and sustained by, two leading arguments, viz.: alarm and necessity. For the validity of these appeals the reader is respectfully commended to that impression which the perusal of this volume may leave upon his mind. If, indeed, Christianity is as well established in the world as the author has supposed, and attempted to show, these alarms are groundless; and if his views of the design and adequacy of the primitive institutions of Christianity are correct, these other forms of operation are not only a diversion, and consequent subtraction, of power, but they would ultimately prove an embarrassment and hinderance to the cause, even if they could have been preserved uncorrupt. They are vicious excrescences requiring excision.

If the author should hereafter see reason to believe, by the reception of this volume, that the public think with him, that in these pages he has only broken ground in a fruitful and important field of in

vestigation, and had space only for *generals* where *particulars* are wanted, it is not unlikely that a SEQUEL will by-and-by appear to meet this demand, and to imbody what has here been unavoidably omitted.

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER I.

Origin and character of Jesuitism.—Ignatius Loyola.—Leaven of Jesuitism in modern Protestant Associations - - Page 13

CHAPTER II.

Genius of Jesuitism.—Is found in all religions in all ages.—Its form in the Papal Church accidental and especially refined.—Ignatius Loyola not a Jesuit.—Jesuitism among Protestants.—Changes its forms.—Present policy of the Papal Church mistaken.—Maria Monk and Rosamond Culbertson.—Immigration of Papists into America not an occasion of apprehension - - - - 24

CHAPTER III.

Papacy the High School of Jesuitism - - - - - - 44

CHAPTER IV.

The Temperance Reformation a failure - - - - 50

CHAPTER V.

The Jesuitical character of several moral and religious societies in our country, and the state of the community in relation to them - - - - - - - - - - - - - 94

CHAPTER VI.

The remedy - - - - - - - - - - 113

CHAPTER VII.

Public Opinion favourable to Christianity - - - - 139

CHAPTER VIII.

Public opinion favourable to the proper exemplifications of Christian character - - - - - - - - - - Page 164

CHAPTER IX.

The world more orthodox than the Church - - - - 178

CHAPTER X.

Infidelity owing to the faults of religionists - - - - 186

CHAPTER XI.

The truth should be told - - - - - - - - - 206

CHAPTER XII.

Temperance doings at Saratoga, August, 1836 - - - - 222

NOTE - - - - - - - - - - - - - 291

McCormick
LIBRARY
Theological Seminary

PROTESTANT JESUITISM.

CHAPTER I.

Origin and character of Jesuitism.—Ignatius Loyola.—Leaven of Jesuitism in modern Protestant Associations.

THE design of this work is to show that Jesuitism is not confined to the Church of Rome; to point out the marks by which it is elsewhere betrayed; and to suggest the remedy.

Jesuitism is nearly synonymous with a pious fraud—a deception practised upon the public to gain an end professedly religious. It is the abstract designation of the spirit and policy of that notable institution which was conceived by Ignatius Loyola; which was rendered more perfect under the administration of Loyola's immediate successors, Laynez and Aquaviva; which sent out its emissaries, and established its influence, with astonishing rapidity, over civilized nations and the most remote barbarous tribes; which put in jeopardy and controlled the power of princes; absorbed the chief sources and principal ramifications of social and political influence; and while professing obedience to Rome, like the janizaries of the Sublime Porte, it held the staff in its own hand, and

thus had nearly brought the world in subjection to its sway, and threatened to bind it in perpetual chains. There is no dishonesty and no crime which its principles did not sanction, and which has not been committed for the attainment of its ends. It prevailed somewhat more than two centuries under its original form. Its enormities, however, having become too flagrant to be endured, even in such a depraved state of society, it was repressed in Portugal in 1769; in France in 1764; in Spain and Naples in 1757; and, at last, was abolished by Pope Clement XIV. in 1773.

The spirit of that institution, however, having once become so thoroughly diffused through all ranks and ramifications of the papal hierarchy and communion, it was morally impossible to eject the leaven by dissolving the society. Indeed, the act of dissolution was probably done principally to satisfy the demands of public sentiment—possibly to get rid of an organization so formidable to the personal sway of a pope, with the design of a reorganization of the institution under different and more tractable modifications, but not less efficient as a foe to the liberties and rights of mankind. The spirit, policy, and practices of Jesuitism have pervaded the Papal Church ever since that society commenced its operations—and no other abatement is even now discoverable, except as it is enforced by improvements in general society. The old and most flagrant enormities of Jesuitism cannot now be practised, because the present state of society

will not tolerate them. It is a prominent feature of the school to accommodate its policy to all opinions and to all states of things which cannot be made to give way and conform to it, and to wait for a fit opportunity to compass its designs.

The origin and progress of this system should be viewed philosophically, else the history of it will operate to the disadvantage of Christianity. And our philosophy, in such an application, must not be superficial; it must descend into the very structure of the human mind—into that mysterious operation of the affections and passions, as they are developed when fanaticism blended with bigotry, beginning with a mixture of truth and error, of correct and erroneous principle, the latter ingredient prevailing over the former, impels the mind alike and equally from the control of common sense and common uprightness, discharges it from the common obligations of society, and lodges it in a region without law to make law for itself—where it takes shelter from human authority by regarding itself above and beyond it, and from divine authority by accommodating its interpretations of divine law to its own exigences. This simple statement will probably account for most, if not all, the moral aberrations of religionists, Christian and pagan, of every age and nation, from the most abominable and murderous atrocities of pagan rites, to the less gross, but scarcely less cruel, enormities of the darkest periods of the Jesuitical school; from these worst practices of

Jesuitism, to its more modern and more refined modes of attaining the same ends; from the Jesuitism of Popery, to that which is to be found under the Protestant name; and from the more flagrant faults of the last, to its more venial, but yet injurious offences.

That pagan religions should have run into errors of this class, is not surprising; because, although generally admitted to have had a divine origin, by some remote and traditional connexion with the earliest and incomplete revelations from Heaven, they have yet been almost thoroughly corrupted, and superstitions of the grossest and most cruel character have been grafted upon them, and, to a great extent, have supplanted all correct notions of religion. Hence the priesthood of pagan religions has generally swayed a complete and absolute supremacy over the human mind—has often sanctioned the grossest impurities and immoralities, and practised the most cruel and murderous rites. These excesses are the genius, the spontaneous growth, of paganism—and are to be accounted for philosophically—or scripturally, which is the same thing—as being the natural offspring of affections and passions, themselves begotten, born, and nurtured by a false and corrupt religion. It has been said most truly, that man is naturally a religious being—by which nothing more is meant than that he has a nature so susceptible of religious impressions and of religious culture, that he must and will have a religion of some sort. Who ever found

a people without a religion? Neither is it any less true, that the natural pravities of the human mind tend, uniformly and irresistibly, to an extravagant, impure, and cruel religion, when unenlightened by Christianity.

But, that such immoralities, and even a code authorizing murder and assassination, should have received the sanction of a company incorporated by the professed head of the Christian Church—as history abundantly and undeniably attests—may well seem strange and unaccountable! But the secret is yet within the reach of apprehension. It is to be found in that state of mind to which we have just alluded, which creates a religious empire of its own, independent of God and of man; which, in the outset, is an empire of fanaticism and bigotry, appropriating truth and falsehood, and as much of the one and the other as may suit its purposes; which gradually degenerates from all truth and from all conscience; and which at last, being driven by the necessities of its condition and from motives of policy, settles down under a system of downright and unprincipled villany. Having once departed from the simple and pure morality of Christianity, there is no stopping-place; the progress is opposite and downward from truth, from right, from conscience, from God.

It is worthy of note—and the fact will be found a very instructive one—that Ignatius Loyola, the founder of Jesuitism, began his religious career apparently as a sincere fanatic. Being of noble

birth, he obtained access to the court of his prince, and occupied for a season the post of king's page; but soon embraced the military profession, in which he distinguished himself against the French in the siege of Pampeluna, and was maimed by a cannon-shot. This misfortune turned his ardent mind to religious reading and contemplation; and the religion of his age being of a mysterious and romantic character, his passion for arms was converted into an ambition to adopt the banner of the cross, and to rival the fame of St. Francis and St. Dominic, by becoming himself the founder of a separate order. His first religious vow was in accordance with the spirit of the time—to make a pilgrimage to Jerusalem. Having deposited his military weapons in the church of Montserrat, and solemnly dedicated himself to the blessed Virgin, his first enterprise was among the poor of an hospital, begging his own bread from door to door, and enduring extreme humiliation to acquire a stock of reputation suited to his new vocation. Charity, perhaps, would award to him a purer motive, and possibly he was actuated by it. He repaired to Rome, and received the benediction of Adrian VI. Thence he made his way to Jerusalem, whence, having disclosed some wild project for converting the heathen of those regions, he was sent back to Europe. Convinced of his want of learning, he devoted himself for a season to letters. But, impatient of delay, having gained some three or four proselytes to his peculiar opinions, he assumed a

particular habit and commenced preaching; but was soon silenced by the Inquisition, and doomed to a more protracted study of theology. Little brooking this interference, he resorted to Paris, joined the university in that city, and was admitted to the degree of master of arts in 1532. Nourishing in his bosom some grand project of his own, which as yet, perhaps, had assumed no definite shape, he succeeded, against much opposition, in bringing over to his views a small corps of associates, whom he had the boldness to initiate in the church of Montmartre, in 1534, under the solemnities of religious vows, which he thought fit to prescribe to them. They afterward organized themselves at Venice in a solemn compact, under the name of "The Company of Jesus," consisting of Loyola and ten associates. He appeared with his companions at Rome in 1537, matured the plan of his order, which was comprised in the vows of poverty and chastity, with the additional engage ment of implicit obedience to their chief, and then submitted it to Pope Paul III. His holiness demurred, till the additional vow of submission to Paul himself had removed his scruples, when he issued a bull to establish the order in 1540, under the name of "The Society of Jesus."

Gifted by nature with a military genius, and bred to arms, Loyola infused into this institution the soul of military discipline, and obtained for himself the high office of first general-in-chief; fixed his quarters at Rome; opened his roll of enlist-

ment, and sent out his companions to every part of the world.

It is generally believed, by those who confide in the fairest interpretation of the averments of history, that this notable man was sincere in his fanaticism; and that he believed, as he taught, that "The Society of Jesus" was the result of an immediate inspiration from Heaven. We are credibly certified, that he was accustomed to preach warmly against the licentiousness of priests and monks; and that, during his life, he laboured personally and assiduously for the conversion of sinners, and more especially of Jews and abandoned characters. We have before us, therefore, in the origin of this stupendous institution,—stupendous alike in its design, structure, and results,—the instructive and impressive lesson, that a religious organization may originate in purity, and be perverted to the worst and most criminal purposes. It is the more important to observe this fact, so far as it may seem worthy of credit, and to keep it in memory, as the principal aim of these pages is to elicit the historical developments, and what would seem to be the natural and uniform tendencies, of a specific principle of religious association, supposed to be identical with the germe of Ignatius Loyola's grand device; and which, of course, accommodates itself, in all ages and countries, to the state and circumstances of society.

We live in an age replete with social organizations, in a great variety of forms, larger and smaller,

for moral and religious reformation—organizations which have sprung up with surprising rapidity—absorbed the most influential portions of the population in Great Britain and the United States—some of which have already assumed a position, become invested with a character, and attained an influence, of stupendous importance. That they have, for the most part, originated with pure and commendable intentions, will doubtless be conceded by all fair minds; that they have done good, and many of them great good, is no less evident; and that they have determined the question of the overwhelming efficiency of a wide-spread association, for any great public design, is abundantly established. The scrutiny to which these societies have hitherto been subjected, and the opposition they have experienced, have arisen for the most part rather from a repugnance to their professed objects, than from any grave and conscientious scruples as to the principles of their organization, and the modes of their operation. Few serious minds have ever thought of the questions involved in these last considerations. Satisfied as to the objects in view, and confiding in the wisdom and virtue of the leaders and agents of these several enterprises, they have never troubled themselves to inquire, whether all is likely to end well that seems to have a hopeful beginning? whether the principles of association are radically sound and safe? or whether the modes of operation are on the whole fair and approvable? The gen-

eral voice has been :—The ends proposed seem to be desirable; and we will help and sustain those who are willing to engage in these enterprises, leaving the methods to their own adoption.

But the influence of these associations has, at last, become so paramount over the wide community; exceptionable modes of operation have been by some of them developed or betrayed in so many forms; the boldness with which they have in many instances pushed their schemes, against the wishes and counsels of more diffident, but confessedly discreet minds; and the growing and tremendous energy with which certain of these combinations have brought their associated influence to bear on private character and rights, and on the interests of individuals, to their prejudice, for having used the right of private judgment, not in opposing, but simply for not falling in with and abetting these plans, when in any case they have seemed to be of questionable utility;—for these, and other reasons of the same class, multitudes of the wisest and most virtuous minds in the community have not only lost much of their respect for the moral and religious associations of the day, but they have been filled with deep anxiety for their reputation and usefulness. In regard to many of them, great numbers of the wise and good, who had given their countenance and lent their aid, are gradually and silently withdrawing their support, while others do not hesitate openly to declare their disrespect. None of these men

question the desirableness of the objects proposed by these institutions, nor are they any the less solicitous to see them achieved; but they have been disheartened and disgusted by these unwar rantable assumptions and unfortunate operations.

The writer of these pages acknowledges that he is among the number of those who have reposed very great confidence in most of the benevolent and religious societies of the day; that he had long time indulged the highest expectations in regard to their prospective achievements; that his faith in them has been but gradually and most reluctantly impaired; and that his anxious observations and scrutiny have at last led him to the conviction, that these developments, so far as they are unhappy, are the unavoidable result of a specific and definite character in the principles of organization. He confides as much as ever in the original pure intentions of these associations, and is confident that a remedy for these evils is available, and may be applied to rescue these enterprises, and secure their objects, by preventing the disasters with which they are now threatened.

In the opinion of the writer, the secret cause of the difficulty is, that most of these institutions are Jesuitical in their organization, and must necessarily become more and more so in their influence, until some change shall have taken place to redeem them from this character and tendency.

CHAPTER II.

Genius of Jesuitism.—Is found in all religions in all ages.—Its form in the Papal Church accidental and especially refined.—Ignatius Loyola not a Jesuit.—Jesuitism among Protestants.—Changes its forms.—Present policy of the Papal Church mistaken.—Maria Monk and Rosamond Culbertson.—Immigration of Papists into America not an occasion of apprehension.

The character of Jesuitism is not to be determined by a history of its origin under this particular name, except as it is viewed in connexion with its tendencies and natural developments. Nor shall we arrive at a just apprehension of it as a genius or spirit, if we imagine that it has been confined to the operations of that particular school or society which has been the accidental occasion of the name. It is a spirit confined to no age, or country, or religion. Wherever the priesthood of any religion, Christian or pagan, have taken advantage of their spiritual influence to serve themselves instead of the public—to gratify ambition, and to obtain power for unworthy ends—there has been developed the proper spirit of Jesuitism. It is not a spirit peculiar to those men who have used the priesthood of Christianity for bad ends. It has prevailed more, committed more shocking enormities, and on a scale infinitely more vast, under the forms of pagan religions than of Christianity. It

is a genius as universal as the religious propensities of man, and the depravities of human nature. We say religious *propensities*—for that term expresses the proneness of man to religious belief. It is a natural and powerful principle—and, unless enlightened, controlled, and chastened by Christianity, its tendencies are always towards extravagance; and the greater the extravagance, the higher and more intense the gratification. Hence the corrupt and ambitious priests of all religions have not only found it easy to impose their fictitious dogmas by nourishing these propensities, but they have found their account in it.

Hence, too, we see, that the Jesuitism of the Romish Church is only an accidental form, in which this spirit or genius has been developed. It was a refinement—the highest consummation of the system. There is no evidence that such results ever entered the mind of Ignatius Loyola. On the contrary, there appears to have been a sincerity, not to say uncorruptness, in his purposes, so far as such a character can belong to fanaticism. And although it is doubtless true, that fanaticism always tends to corrupt the mind, yet its first corruptions may be based on purity of intention. Loyola was a genius—a great man; as is sufficiently proved by the conception and organization of his great scheme. Could his genius have presided over his work after his demise and onward, balanced by what may charitably be supposed to have been his virtue; or, could it have been so

ordered, that all the members of that society should be like Francis Xavier, it is probable, not only that the bad principles and malepractices which belong to the history of that institution would have been wanting, but that it would have achieved wonders of good to mankind. But neither was human nature, nor the age, good enough to render the existence of such a society safe; and however it may be probable that the present age would impose restraints on the tendencies of such an institution to aberrations from its proper design, yet it may be, and most likely is, equally true, that human nature is no more to be intrusted with such irresponsible powers in a secret society now than then; or in a great religious association, enjoying public confidence, but having its counsels in its own keeping.

It is a remarkable fact, that the present history of our country presents the spectacle of religious and reforming associations as nearly conformed, in the principles and plan of their organization and in their object, to Ignatius Loyola's great scheme, as the time and circumstances will permit. And what is more, they have already begun to develop symptoms of a tendency to similar results. Even yet more: Loyola and his successors were compelled to vow submission to the pope, and in this way a check and control were held over them; whereas these societies of our own time and country acknowledge no supervision. The pope is held accountable to the public—at least he is virtually accountable, for all that act under his authority;

and he actually dissolved this society when the public could no longer endure it. But what power shall dissolve an *independent* association, when it shall have attained an irresistible supremacy?

It is by no means to be apprehended that Jesuitism will attempt to re-enact those parts of its history, in the same forms, which have been universally reprobated. That would be entirely opposed to its character for shrewdness and policy. It is by far too wise. It would no longer be itself if it were to do so. Protestants may be assured that the Jesuits of the Papal Church will never be caught in such folly; and while they are watched and pursued in that direction, they are actually on another tack. Nor is the policy of the Papal Church, as a whole, such as is commonly imagined among us. Whatever may be thought or said in this country to the contrary, she is humbled and abased before the world. The arm of her power has been broken. She was crushed in France; she has been overrun by military force in Italy; in Spain and Portugal her priests would be butchered at her own altars, if the resentments of the people could have sway; she is a bankrupt in her own dominions; and her only chance of recovering influence in the world is by a thorough reformation—by conforming to the character and demands of the age. Of this she is aware.

To reform that church, however, is not so easy, on account of the extent and obstinacy of its corruptions. But that its high and influential dignitaries

feel the importance of it, as a course of policy, there can be no doubt. They know well that the world will no longer endure the vicious and criminal practices, under a religious garb, which have heretofore been tolerated. Even those communities which are most thoroughly papal in their religious preferences and attachments, will not endure them; much less can they be committed or carried on systematically under the light of Protestantism. Doubtless there are yet many sinks of pollution and dens of vice unpurified within the precincts of papal jurisdiction, and remote from the arm of discipline; but to assume that the authorities of the papal empire patronise, encourage, and foster practices which all Christendom reprobates, is to demand belief in a moral impossibility; it is the very charge which they desire to see the Protestant world bringing against them, because they know it cannot be sustained; and that, failing to be made out, it will operate to their advantage. It is impossible to say any thing worse of the Papal Church than has been said and extensively believed;—and said not without reason;—and yet that church lives, and not only lives, but flourishes. But when once it shall be settled and known that the charges still brought against that community are not true in application to the present state of things, though once there may have been a ground for them, the public mind will unquestionably turn in their favour, as it is always ready to sympathize with the injured.

Nothing can be more unwise, therefore, and

nothing more sure to operate in favour of the Church of Rome, than the attempts lately made to give currency and credit to such stories as Maria Monk, Rosamond Culbertson, &c. &c. That corrupt and abandoned priests in the West Indies and South America are addicted to all manner of vice and crime, is easy to believe. But the Narrative of Rosamond has too much the air of romance, and too much of the unnatural, to be credited. She acknowledges herself to have been once a crazy woman; and her book is proof enough that she ought still to be under treatment for the same infirmity.

It is enough to say of Maria Monk's "Awful Disclosures," that the British government will now see to that matter, if there be "the shade of a shadow" of truth in them. Nothing would suit them better than the laying open of such scenes, if they were to be found; or making out proof of them, if they have existed. It is a business to which the British government are fairly entitled by their hereditary hatred of the Papal Church; and which they will be sure to do most thoroughly, if there is any encouragement for it. The papists must have been fools, indeed, if they have been so imprudent. It is impossible. We hesitate not to say, that such things could not be done in this age, nor hardly the most innocent of them, on any spot of the papal territories of Italy. We happen to know that the first meeting of Protestants called together in the city of New-York, in 1835, to hear and advise as

to the publication of this book, and who all had a good appetite for things of this kind, were thoroughly disgusted—gave their voice against it—and retired under the most disagreeable impressions, with the exception of a single gentleman, who evidently gave not the least credit to the story, but said—"its publication could do no harm." In this he was wrong. All others present believed it would do harm; and their first impressions will doubtless be the last of the wide community—a deep and thorough disgust.

The evil of such publications is manifold: it not only injures the Protestant cause, and helps Popery, but it corrupts public morals. The effect is precisely the same as that produced by the prints and statements of the worst things done in the bad-houses of New-York, not long since spread out before the eye of the public by an agent of a benevolent society. How parents can consent that such books should come within reach of their children, may well seem strange! It is mortifying that our Protestant community should have an appetite for such scandal; and great is the responsibility of those who pander to it!

The taste for these publications, and the excitement produced by them, are the natural product of that false alarm which the Jesuitism of our own country has attempted to raise against the Jesuitism of Rome. Here is rogue chasing rogue—Jesuit in pursuit of Jesuit—but the older rogue is the wiser, because he has been longer in practice:

he will not be overtaken, for the sufficient reason that his pursuer is on the wrong scent.

The Rev. Mr. Dwight, Missionary of the American Board of Commissioners of Foreign Missions, favourably known to the public in the Journal of Dwight and Smith, 2 vols., giving us much sober and useful information of the countries and people visited by them, wrote some letters two or three years ago for the American public, to show that this alarm about the inroads of Papists and Jesuits into our country was quite unnecessary; and that, as Christians, we should rather be glad than sorry they had come, and are still coming in such shoals, inasmuch as they are likely to fall under the light of Protestantism, and will give us a fair opportunity to convince them how much better Protestantism is than Popery. These letters were published. Mr. Dwight had been abroad; his views had become enlarged; he had seen the Roman, the Greek, and the Mohammedan religions in all their forms; he had found out that the world were quite tired of all three, and wanted something better; he had dismissed the vapours of the imagination, and mingled with matters of fact; he believed, so we think, that the superstitions and abominations of Popery had attained their *ne plus ultra;* that the Jesuits, and that infidelity which Jesuitism and Popery had begotten, had done their worst; that each and all were generally despised; that the world was prepared for a favourable change, if an adequate redeeming power could

be brought to bear upon it;—and, above all, he had so much confidence in Protestant principles, as to believe they would remain unshaken, not only against the influence of scattered immigrations of papists into America, but against all the power of Rome. To him it doubtless appeared ridiculous that Romanists were about to take America by storm! If American principles could be subdued so easily, why, then, let them go; what are they good for?

The spirit of Mr. Dwight's letters may be supposed as follows:—"You, American Christians, have sent out me and my colleagues, a little band, to convert Papists, Mohammedans, and others, on their own ground, by the superior force of our principles; and behold! you are frightened the moment a few straggling papists have found their way into your own territory, lest they should convert you! This division of labour is the very thing you should have prayed for; the work is come to your hands; try, now, the strength of your principles, and the excellence of your faith. If you believe that *we* can make an impression, and do good *here*, on this immense and solid mass, buried and panoplied in a false religion, surely you will find it an easy matter to manage the *few* who are thus providentially thrown so immediately within your reach. Do you mean to say that you are afraid of them?"

"Ah! but the Jesuits have come."

"Jesuits? who and what are they? gods?"

"But they have brought over money."

"Suppose they have; you are not the people to be bought."

"But they will build churches, schools, and colleges; and get our youth and people."

"I tell you, the papists are as poor as the mice of their deserted and dilapidated churches; and the pope himself is a bankrupt, or about to become one. I doubt this story. Go to the pope's banker, himself a Protestant, in the city of New-York, through whose hands this money is remitted, and he will dispel your fears at once on this score."

"But are there not other bankers in this service?"

"If so, it can be ascertained. Bills of exchange cannot be negotiated and paid without somebody's knowing the origin and designation of the money. What signifies *imagining* all this mischief, when, if it really exists, it is perfectly easy to lay the hand upon it? But, admitting there is money sent —the more the better; it enriches the country; and certainly you are not afraid for your principles."

It has been said by some one that "alarm has become a trade in the community, and the love of excitement the appetite that supports it;" and nothing is more true. All this clamour about the designs, the spread, and rising influence of Popery in this country, is historically described in the above remark. We are inclined, however, charitably to believe, that many, if not most of those who have

taken up the echo, and sent it over the land, from the Eastern hills to the Alleghany tops, and passed it over the wide vale of the Mississippi, have done it very sincerely. They have caught the contagion, become nervous, and doubtless really think so. But the secret of the whole matter, when scrutinized, will be found in the convenience of such an excitement to keep in motion certain machineries which have been formed, and which must have a needful supply of power. The people of this land—and it is a common attribute of human nature—love excitement; and, unfortunately, there are those who know how to produce it and profit by it. When the bulletin announcing the papal invasion of our shores and territories has spent its influence, because the enemy cannot be seen, in comes Miss Reed's "Six Months in a Convent," and the Ursuline School is in flames! When this is well digested,—which, it must be confessed, had in it some substantial nutriment, though a good deal of "ardent spirit," producing no small measure of intoxication—then comes Maria Monk, one of the most arrant fictions that was ever palmed upon the community. But the appetite is good, and it is all swallowed. Close upon the heels of this comes "Rosamond's Narrative," supported and recommended by the veritable certificates of reverend divines—illustrated with plates—the representations of which, in connexion with the text, would rank well with Mr. McDowall's edifying pictures—all for the instruction and benefit of our

children and youth of both sexes,—to be found all over the land on the same table with the Bible! Can a sober man lay his hand upon his conscience and say there is no Jesuitism at the bottom of all this?—that the Protestants of this land, in their crusade against Popery, have not taken the weapons of their adversaries to fight them with?

For himself, the author believes with Mr. Dwight, that, with the true missionary spirit, desiring the conversion of papists to pure Christianity, and confiding in Protestant principles, their immigration here is the very thing to be desired. Politically, as a statesman, he might view the question differently. He confesses, in that light, he does not like the rapid increase of foreigners among us. But it is not because he has any apprehension that papacy is likely to supplant Protestantism. Such a fear would be a libel upon our principles, in this age of light, and in such advantageous circumstances; it would be a confession of their weakness and want of reason. It is morally impossible that papacy, in its proper character, should flourish here. And if it can be modified, reformed, brought back to the primitive character of Christianity, that, surely, is a consummation most devoutly to be wished by every Christian. It is not probable that the Papal Church will ever be dissolved; but more likely, that the spirit of a coming age, that God's providence and grace, will force it to a thorough and complete reformation. But that can never be except by coming in contact with Prot-

estantism, and being influenced by its light. And that was the conception of Mr. Dwight's enlarged and liberal mind. We heartily wish that the American Board would send out more such missionaries; they are worthy to be in the field; and will send back a healthful influence to whence they go forth. Such letters as Mr. Dwight's make people think; enlarge their minds; and tend to redeem them from contracted views. It requires some boldness, indeed, to encounter such prejudices; but, nevertheless, such minds are made to do it; their influence is felt; it does good.

It is humiliating to think that the public mind of this country should have fallen so much under the guidance and control of these originators and agents of such contracted plans, and that it should be brought to believe such preposterous and incredible things; that the public taste should have been so corrupted as to entertain and relish such scandal. We believe, however, that this influence and this effect are circumscribed, and that a little reflection will restore a proper feeling. It is unmanly, it is positively injurious, to yield to such statements; if the public were to be long under their dominion, they would be frightened at a shadow, lose all confidence in their better principles, and become fit subjects for that very invasion and triumph which have been predicted. Nothing is more sure to produce such a result; for a Protestant religion, under such influences, will become so degenerate, that the example of reformed and

more circumspect Romanists will seem to the world to be better. Let it not be forgotten, that the Romanists in this land will take good care that the faults ascribed to them shall not be found; and the consequence is inevitable, that their religion will ultimately triumph over those who are principally occupied in bringing false charges. It is bad business; it unchristianizes the Christian, and eclipses all his virtues. Certainly American Protestants can be more profitably employed. It is an unamiable work.

As an incidental proof of the groundlessness of the alarm lately sounded in this country about the pope's special favours meditated and beginning to descend on the people of the United States, take the following extracts from the note-book of an American citizen, giving an account of his presentation to his holiness, February, 1835, in company with other citizens of our republic, by our consul at Rome, Mr. Cicognani:—

"When I entered the presence-chamber, his holiness was raising from his knee our consul; with good sense, the *ceremonials* do not require *Protestants* to kneel. The Americans were left standing. Our names were pronounced, and, as each gentleman bowed, the most holy father turned towards him with a slight inclination of the head; and exclaimed, when the catalogue was ended, in a gay and affable manner, '*Eh come e possibili di recordame de tutti questi nome?*'—(How in the world

am I to remember all these names?) He was dressed in the robes of his order, pure white woollen turned up with white silk—naught indicated the pope excepting the red cross upon his white slipper. His height is not remarkable; his person somewhat portly—more so than would be expected from his known temperance; his face by no means marking his advanced age, and pleasing, notwithstanding he has too large a nose; his voice agreeable and strong—how strong, I had a proof a few days ago, as it resounded in the Sistino chapel; his bearing was modest and affable, and with becoming dignity. He half leaned upon a table, and conversed about half an hour in Italian, Mr. C. acting occasionally as interpreter. He spoke only of church matters; of the progress of the 'true faith' in the United States; admired greatly Bishop England; was astonished at the rapidity with which he travelled, and gave an entire tour of the bishop's last visitation from New-York all through the United States; to Havana, thence to France, and so on to the Eternal City. He inquired of a gentleman from Maryland about several acquaintances. Asked me if I knew Bishop ——, of Missouri, or Bishop Portier, and seemed pleased to learn that I had been a scholar of the latter prelate; said he was an excellent man. The entire conversation showed that his holiness was perfectly conversant with America. His assurances were, that he was perfectly well satisfied with us, and begged that we would inform our governors that he was so.

'I am very well pleased with the United States; for,' he continued, numbering his reasons with one finger upon the fingers of his other hand, just as I have seen a certain gentleman of high standing at our bar—'I am well pleased, for the Catholics there are a good people—then the bishops are good bishops, very good indeed. I am well pleased, for the government protects the Catholic religion.' 'Say to his holiness,' said a dapper dandy, with more of what we considered spirit than either good sense or politeness—'Say to his holiness that our government protects all religions.'—'What does the gentleman remark?'—'He says,' answered Mr. C., 'that the United States have always protected the Catholic religion.' How different the state of this pope's prerogative from that of Hildebrand or Julius, when he must be flattered with a shadow by the cautious suppression of truth! After this blunder our consul thought it high time to remove his backwoodsmen, knelt, and presented a petition for indulgence during Lent, which was granted. Several gentlemen brought rosaries to be blessed; this his holiness readily did, after having first asked if they were intended for Catholics. Mr. C. again knelt, and we were bowed out. The impression left upon me is, that simplicity and amiability may be found in high places, and Christian humility in an ecclesiastical prince; and I am readily disposed to believe all the good the Romans are fond of repeating of their Pope Gregory XVI. W. F. B."

The simplicity and naturalness of this narrative, as well as its inherent marks of probability, are sufficient vouchers of its correctness. On that point the reader will be satisfied. What, then, are the inferences? First, that the pope is far from enacting the part of a Jesuit here: he declares frankly the interest he feels in the United States; praises the character and compliments the fidelity and industry of his own bishops, &c.; says he is "well satisfied with us," and "begs that our governors may be so informed."—"I am well pleased with the United States, for the Catholics there are a good people—then the bishops are good bishops, very good indeed. I am well pleased, because the government protects the Catholic religion." Thus much the pope knows, and very civilly expresses his gratitude.

But suppose the charges of the pope's designs on the United States were well founded—could such a conversation have taken place? Would he be likely to send his compliments to the "governors" of the United States, that he is well pleased in having their help, and in being so well supported by them in his machinations for undermining our institutions, &c.? If so, it must indeed have been a refinement of Jesuitism beyond all former refinements, so effectually to conceal his art by the appearance of such artlessness! If this be an honest record of an honest transaction, the pope must be as ignorant and as innocent of the plan, of which he stands accused against our country, as a new-

born infant. He did not at that time even know that he was suspected, else the conversation must have taken a very different turn. Pope Gregory XVI. seems to be otherwise occupied; for Mr. Dewey informs us, "that it is found quite impossible to restrain the present pontiff from a course of expenses [for domestic purposes, we understand] which threaten the ruin, in temporal power, of the Papal See. It is said that the annual expenses of the government now exceed the income by about *three million of piastres*. To meet this deficiency, the revenues [prospective] from one village and district after another of the Roman state are pledged away to the bankers, from whom the money is borrowed, without any prospect of redemption; and I am told that ten or twelve years of extravagances like this must leave the papal exchequer in a state of complete bankruptcy." One of these extravagances is the rebuilding of St. Paul's Cathedral, which a few years ago was burnt down. We are informed by the same authority that the income of the Propaganda has decreased, since the conquest of Italy by Bonaparte, from $300,000 per annum to $100,000—which sum is much exceeded by the annual revenue of several Protestant missionary and other societies in Great Britain and America.

It will perhaps be suspected that the author of the narrative of presentation to the pope, introduced above, was a papist, as the fact of his having been a pupil of Bishop Portier is recognised,

and that therefore his story is partial and Jesuitical. Admitting that he was a papist, being a citizen of New-Orleans and a man of the world, it is not at all probable that in such a connexion he was aware of our American Protestant alarms, &c. But in the ceremony of presentation he classes himself among the Protestants, who were not required to *kneel*. Farther, in another part of this narrative, not quoted above, he speaks of "the head and mother of all churches" as a ridiculous pretension. He alludes sarcastically to "the carnal weapons" of the 3000 household troops of "the most holy father," as being needful to protect "his sanctity" [*santita*]; and avers, that "even these arguments of kings have not always availed"—alluding to the captivity of the pope under the arrest of Napoleon. He also brings out a curious domestic secret of the pope's order of the day for Sunday, which accidentally met his eye, suspended on the wall in a frame, from which it appears, that "On Sunday morning the head of the church sees the minister of state, and on Sunday evening transacts business with the manager of the papal lotteries"—not very puritanical.

Another curious development on this occasion: "An old general [on duty in the Vatican] accosted me, and said 'he was an Italian; was well acquainted with American affairs; was perfectly aware the Americans are white and speak English; the first time he had heard there was such a nation he had learned that much; it was about twenty-five

years ago, when he saw an American flotilla of beautiful ships off the coast of Africa,'" &c. We do not pretend that it would be fair to *generalize* from this isolated case of ignorance in a person of high office in the Vatican, to prove that such heads cannot be supposed to have devised such nefarious and diabolical designs against America as are averred; for this deponent saith—"The entire conversation [with the pope] showed that his holiness was perfectly conversant with America."

CHAPTER III.

Papacy the High School of Jesuitism.

It has already been remarked, that Jesuitism accommodates itself to circumstances. It is impossible, therefore, in this age of light and general information, that it should assume those gross and palpably offensive forms which in former ages characterized the grand school known by the name of Jesuits, and which have been so abundantly exposed by Pascal and others. Even in the Papal Church, Jesuits are known to a great extent to be circumspect and exemplary before the world—unimpeachable in the relations and conduct of life, so far as they can be observed. It is impossible to say how many of them are as pure in their minds as seems to be accredited by their external conduct —in other words, how many are not Jesuits in the character commonly ascribed to them by Protestants. The character and demands of the age have modified—we may say, purified them. It is vain to deny that there are pure and exemplary men belonging to the papal priesthood, both in Europe and America; and common charity would also award to them the character of Christian conscientiousness. This tribute of respect has been cheerfully and honourably given by the puritan Protestants of

Boston to Bishop Cheverus, as certified by his life and labours, while resident in the metropolis of New-England—afterward a cardinal, and a candidate for the triple crown; and to Bishop England, of Charleston, by those Protestants who knew him. It is equally well deserved, no doubt, by many prelates and dignitaries of that church who might be named. There have even been popes, whose Christian character cannot be questioned. Instead of being prone to deny the virtues and worth of papists, clergy or laity, where they are apparent, it is not only more honourable, but more for the interests of Protestants, to admit and hail the proof. The impression of such worth is made on the world, and a refusal to acknowledge it is unhappy in its influence, and will unavoidably operate more to the advantage of the proscribed, than the admission of it.

As intimated in the last chapter, we believe that the present policy of the Church of Rome is to reform and purify itself, as presenting the only prospect of maintaining its ground in the world. We do not, however, believe that she has conceived or proposes any plan of reformation, that promises to bring her back to primitive purity and simplicity; but only to purge away those enormities, against which the opinions and taste of the age have been so fully declared—to the end that she may stand acquitted of those grave charges, which have been so long brought and so well sustained; and that she may be restored to the respect and good

opinion of mankind. It is to conform herself to the decencies of the present state of civilized society. This resolution is for the most part the fruit of a policy, and not the result of a conscientious effort; for the papal hierarchy is a grand political institution, and occupies a political position in relation to all the world. It is the oldest institution of this class in human society now existing; it possesses in its archives the records of the oldest and most tried school of political experience; it has ever been governed by the counsels of the wisest and greatest of men; the greatest and wisest men are still at its head; and although its policy is its own and peculiar, it is nevertheless a polity well entitled to have the jealous watch of all other governments, and of all the world. The best definition of this hierarchy would be the simplest and most exact definition of the genius of Jesuitism—*a religious society governed by principles of human policy for worldly ends.* In all forms of application of the term *Jesuitism* which we have made, and propose to make, in the progress of this work, a reference is had to the above form of statement, standing in italics. Of course, it is to be understood, that the spirit of Jesuitism may exist and be developed in the isolated position of individuals, and may in such a case be fairly ascribed to them, although accident may have sundered them from any concert with others.

Jesuitism differs from the spirit of Christianity, as human competition for secular and worldly pur-

poses differs from aims which have a lodgment in heaven, and from acts which are based on a divine precept having reference to the interests of eternity in contradistinction to the interests of time. In pretension Jesuitism is identical with these high religious aims; but, in fact, it has the grovelling character of a worldly purpose. The spirit of Christianity relies on measures which revelation has prescribed for the accomplishment of its ends; Jesuitism on human device. The former cherishes the relations of dependance on God; the latter consults its relation to man. Christianity discards the policies of earth; whereas Jesuitism does not look beyond them. The spirit of Christianity takes up its position on the platform of revealed wisdom, and by the side of Omnipotence; Jesuitism feels only that it is in conflict with the wisdom of man, and consecrates its energies to outdo man. The former is scrupulous in employing only such measures as God has authorized; while the latter assumes that the end sanctifies the means. In a word, the spirit of Christianity is above the world, eschewing its counsels; while Jesuitism is in the world, actuated and controlled by circumstances. But Jesuitism is always careful to appear to be clad in the same garb, and professes to be actuated by the same spirit. This is Jesuitism in its nakedness—in its principle—in its original, unmixed, unmodified state: *It employs religion to gain the world.*

Such is the character of the grand hierarchy of

Rome. It is itself the High School—the normal institution—the perfect model—the university—where are graduated, and whence are sent forth upon the world, its finished scholars; and every priest is a Jesuit. That is—a Jesuit in commission. It may be, however, and candour obliges us to admit, that every papal priest is not a Jesuit in character, in heart. There are doubtless among them pure and conscientious men, who are incapable of acting on the principles of such a school. Nevertheless, it is their duty as faithful adherents of that church.

The system of papacy is the finished work of human wisdom, grafted on a spiritual influence unlawfully acquired and appropriated. Its perfection consists in being built upon and incorporated with a spiritual influence as a base—as the radical ingredient—the skeleton form. Spiritual influence is its place of sanctuary, where no vulgar eyes can see, no profane feet approach, no hostile hands invade. It is a secure adytum, an impalpable panoply, an inexhaustible magazine, a battery apparently masked, but ever open and well attended. It is this which has given to papacy advantage and supremacy over other policies, which pretend to no such connexions. The king has dominion over the body; the pope over the soul. The king enjoys the allegiance of his subjects contingently; and the contingency is vested in the absolving power of the pope. Although this claim may in these modern days be laughed at by the prince, it may

yet become practically a grave matter to him, so long as it has a hold on the conscience of the devotee that is his subject.

The fabric of the papal polity is the work of many centuries; human wisdom has been exhausted upon it; there is no room for improvement in a thing of this kind. All its principles are well understood by its priesthood, who are scattered over the face of the earth, clustered around the thrones of kings, standing daily to minister in their pulpits, closeted with the learned and influential, and admitted to the sanctuaries of domestic privacy, to preside over the pupilage of infancy, and dictate the last testament of the dying. And it is a system of pure human policy, which manages and directs the whole, to acquire and secure influence. Its position affects to be *relative to God;* it is in fact *relative to man.* Its sanctions come armed with the mysterious power of a spiritual influence, while its counsels are political.

While, therefore, we would be generous in giving credit for the life, manners, and Christian zeal of individual members of the Church of Rome, wherever there is credible evidence of their personal worth, whether of the clergy or laity, we are compelled to the conclusion, from the history and aspects of that complicated and vast hierarchical polity, that it is radically and thoroughly corrupt—an institution based and managed on worldly principles—and, as such, the highest and most perfect school of Jesuitism which the world has ever seen.

CHAPTER IV.

The Temperance Reformation a failure.

It is impossible that the public of this country should not have observed the rapid growth and increasing influence of the Temperance Society; and discerning minds must also have noticed, that, for the accomplishment of its objects, high pressure forces of the nature of compulsion have been contrived and employed, in ways and to an amount not very approvable. If the reformation were real to the extent declared; if it were sound and healthful, and based upon correct principles; if the ground supposed to be occupied in the stages of its progress could be maintained, and advances were still practicable in the same career, it must be conceded that it would be unwise and wrong to attempt to arrest its progress, or to throw any obstacles in its way. But in the examination now proposed, and in the statements which the author has to make, he professes to be as conscientious as any person can ever have been in pursuing the opposite course. He thinks the time has come not only when the community must pause, but when they have already begun to pause, over the extraordinary doctrines and proceedings of this society and its cognate ramifications. We know,

from actual observation, that great numbers of our most respectable citizens have passed gradually and entirely through, from an original and great respect for the temperance cause, so called, to a state of diffidence; from diffidence to disrespect; and that not a few have taken pains to show their contempt.

The arrogance, dictatorial airs, and tyranny, assumed and practised by this society over the public, and over individuals, are only one of the modes in which a reforming empiricism has recently overrun the land. But, as it has rather outdone any other race of the kind in the phrensy and fury of its career, abolitionism perhaps excepted, it presents a more notable example for consideration. Had not the writer of these pages been convinced that this society is doing more hurt than good, he would not have meddled with it. We shall proceed to give some reasons for this belief.

The society set out with extravagant and incredible statements of fact; and has been obliged, in order to keep up the excitement and maintain its influence, to continue that course. The author's own theory is, that all extravagance in doctrine and fact, palmed upon the public for practical purposes, is pernicious in its influence; and observation has confirmed this theory. This has been most strikingly evinced in the efforts for the temperance reformation.

When the writer first began to listen to the public lecturers on this subject as they were going

about the country, and to the corresponding emanations of the press, his nerves shrunk from the statements most in use, as they have ever done since, under the feeling that they demanded an unreasonable faith; but, notwithstanding, in so good a cause he was disposed to overlook them for the sake of the end in view. But the perpetual iteration of extravagance on the public mind, however important and hallowed may be the purpose, —and the more so, the worse the effect, while suspicion is awake, and the conviction finally established that such is its character,—renders the public callous to the impressions designed to be produced, and sensible people turn away in disgust.

It is possible, however, with the great mass of the community, and so long as the popular mind is infected with the love and determination for excitement,—and especially so long as the people are urged on by an organized corps of itinerating, artful, everywhere-present empirics,—in such a state of things, it is even possible to carry an unreasonable, unphilosophical theory by storm, against the sobriety and good sense of the community. The great public, busy about other matters and their private concerns, but finding gratification at intervals of repose in sympathizing with philanthropic projects, are always ready to be wrought upon by an adequate machinery. Voluntary and hasty organizations have been the fashion of the day. Whatever is started, a national society must at once be got up, which is imposing in its very

name; a list of respectable names must be obtained, as members and patrons, which is also imposing and influential; a secretary and an adequate corps of assistants must be appointed and provided for from the first-fruits of collections; a band of popular lecturers must be commissioned, and sent forth as agents on the wide public; the press, with its many-winged messengers, is put in operation; certificates fitted for the purpose are made out, submitted, subscribed, and sworn to; the entire machinery is put in operation; subsidiary societies are multiplied over the length and breadth of the land; the end proposed is manifestly a good one; and how can the community resist the sway of such an influence? Nobody feels it his duty to oppose, for the cause is good; every one believes, because everybody else does; credit in all statements goes by authority, not by conviction; the prime agents believe, first, because it is their duty, and next, because, having told the story so long, they have no doubt of its truth; new discoveries are made, new sophistries invented, new facts developed on hypothetical statements; tracts and books are written, and find a ready market; the daily and weekly journals are burdened with the weight of new matter, and with new versions or repetitions of old; it is "line upon line, and precept upon precept, here a little and there a little;" the heavens above and the depths beneath, fire, earth, air, wind, and water, are ransacked, and fail not to yield their treasures of things new and old.

In a word, the public are overwhelmed—literally carried by storm—there is no resisting it. Thinking is out of the question. The fashion and necessity are, to fall in with the current, and float along with it. It is the easiest and cheapest. Who can stop to examine such an accumulation—such a world of materials? Who so presumptuous as to dissent from such a weight and amount of authority? He might as well throw himself in the way of an avalanche, or stretch out his hands to stay the progress of yonder comet, that comes from unknown regions, and is sweeping through the heavens.

It is singular, and even marvellous, that a cause so simple as that of temperance should have been made so complicated; that the only philosophical theory appertaining to the subject, at first indistinctly recognised, because common sense had a little to do with it, has been overlooked, and at last completely buried in a mass of false theories; and that the only tenable position has been abandoned for a wide and ever-widening field of untenable speculation. The theories now most prevalent, and the popular belief founded upon them, have lost sight of the proper merits of the question. If this were simply a harmless mistake, or a harmless series or concatenation of mistakes, to be dropped into the sea, whence they have been fished up, when the public shall have been satisfactorily amused by them—since they must have an occupation—the best treatment would be to let them have their

day. But, unfortunately, these mistakes are practical and influential; they have to do with the health, the physical and moral energies, the well-being, and very life of the community. That which they are intended to benefit, they injure; that which they are brought in to save, they destroy.

The only theory that can be maintained on the subject of temperance is, that the stimulation produced by alcohol is injurious to the animal economy on certain contingencies. This is its simple form of statement—and it applies to animal nature, without qualification or restriction, only in its most healthy and perfect state, as in the condition of infancy. That it is injurious in all states of the animal economy, and in all degrees of application, is a theory of empiricism. For alcohol is as legitimately and philosophically an item, and a useful item, in the materia medica, as any that can be named. Certain substances, called poisons, are injurious, and when administered in given portions, prove fatal to animal nature. Therefore, empiricism says, they are injurious in all cases and in all degrees. This is not true. It is known that arsenic is ordered and used in the practice of medicine for the relief of certain diseased conditions, or local diseased affections, of the human body.

But what is a poison? All that can be said in answer to this inquiry is, that it is an active agent when applied to the animal economy in certain

specific relations, internally or externally. Some act from an external application; others have their power by being administered internally. Both classes—all, may be innocent, and even useful, as parts of materia medica, when employed scientifically and skilfully. It is only in unskilful hands, or by blind accident, that they prove injurious.

Admitting that alcohol is a poison, under the general definition of an active agent, it is not a poison in the common sense of the term. The substances commonly called poisons are, if the writer does not mistake, not only violent, but rending, dissolving agents, when applied or administered to the animal economy in sufficient quantities. It is here supposed that they are dissolvents in all cases, and always have that tendency by a direct action. Their inflammatory agency is not a stimulating, sustaining power, even temporarily. They are in no case tonics, provoking and assisting nature in a languishing state to a more vigorous and healthful action, although they may be employed to counteract, and perhaps to eradicate disease.

Alcohol is not a poison in this sense. It is simply a stimulating agent. Its injurious effects are produced, not by direct, but indirect action—more properly, by reaction. When administered in a suitable degree, it may act as a tonic on the languishing functions of nature, where disease or excessive abstinence has enfeebled the constitution. It may even be used habitually and excessively for

years, till a man has become a drunkard, and his constitution shattered by the *delirium tremens;* and yet, if he could be induced to break off at this point, nature, by the force of its vital energies, other hinderances out of the way, would renovate herself. The injury produced is by a reaction consequent on an habitual and excessive stimulation, and not by the dissolving power of a chymical poisonous agent. The animal constitution is not *undermined* by the latter, but *shattered* by the former cause. Both, doubtless, are destructive; but they are not the same class of agents, nor are their modes of operation the same, but diverse and opposite. The one stimulates, and ultimately breaks down and dissolves the constitution by *indirect* action, while the other marches directly and immediately to its destination. Hence the facetious but truly philosophical retort, which has often been made by gray-headed but temperate drinkers of ardent spirits to the abstinent theorists, that if alcohol be a poison, it is certainly a *very slow one.*

The author has long since been prepared and resolved to go all lengths in the war of extermination against the common use of ardent spirits; and he still believes, conscientiously, that the good of society and of our race demands it. But he cannot be convinced that this point is to be gained so well or so soon by a sacrifice of truth, and by a false philosophy; or that a fanatical crusade against vice can be so salutary as a sober but de-

termined reformation, conducted on enlightened principles. The danger of alcoholic drinks does not arise from the fact that they are a poison in the common sense of this term, but simply from the consideration that the unnatural appetite created by the habitual use of them, in many cases, becomes ungovernable, unmans man, and converts him into a brute, a savage, a fiend; destroys himself, and desolates society. The true and sober statement of the case is sad and melancholy enough to present all the motives that are required for an adequate reformation.

The author cannot, however, with his present views, yield to the theory that would eject alcohol from the materia medica, even though it be set down as a poison. Poisons are not of course injurious. That depends on two contingencies: the state of the body, and the degree administered. They may be, and often are, beneficial; nay, they are useful and indispensable. In the accidental and constantly fluctuating states to which the animal economy of man is liable, we could not do without poison. It is constantly used—used in medicine, in food, in drinks; pervades our animal natures as an ingredient of their composition; it runs in our blood; lies in the natural depositories of secretion; lurks everywhere in our systems; oozes from the pores of the skin, and may be collected from the surface of the body. The chymist will find it in all these places and conditions, if we could afford

to submit ourselves as the subjects of his experimenting hand. Of this there is no doubt.

Tobacco is a poison—a palpably destructive one—in all its degrees; and yet great numbers of men, clergy and others, may be found smoking, chewing, and spitting away their nervous vigour, their health, their lives, who would be horror-struck if they should see their neighbour drink a glass of wine, and would most certainly inflict upon him an uncompromising lecture on total abstinence! The man who uses tobacco must live proportionably high in the selection and use of his meats and drinks—else he will assuredly die, and die soon, if his indulgence is considerable. Our natures cannot resist the wear and tear of such a tremendous agent—of such a poison. We may use wine with impunity, not to say for our advantage, in moderate degrees; we can stand the shock of the habitual use of ardent spirits, in a limited measure, maintaining what would once have been called a temperate degree; a feeble constitution, under such a strict regimen, may even be benefited by it; but no feeble man can bear the use of tobacco, unless he eats and drinks proportionately in his own defence. And yet those very men who use tobacco habitually and disgustingly tell us, that alcohol in every form and degree is a poison and destructive, in fermented liquors as well as in ardent spirits; and they solemnly warn us against it. They have pronounced the production and use of wine a sin—a moral wrong—against society and against God; and for

the same reason, certainly, if there be any reason in it, that the production and use of tobacco is a sin!

The main theory now relied upon in the totally abstinent system, if we rightly apprehend their position, viz., that alcohol in all forms and degrees is a poison—is sophistical and fallacious—a vulgar error, and an empirical doctrine, if our definition of a poison is a proper one. If it is only a poison, it is a very harmless thing; it may even be beneficial, prudently administered. There is no occasion of alarm, no argument against its use, on that account simply. To escape from poison, in meats or in drinks, or in any possible way, we must go out of the world. Indeed, we could not do without it; it is one of the indispensable agents in the world of nature around and within us—for health to keep us well, and for sickness to make us well. It is by overlooking the true theory, that the Temperance reformers have placed themselves in this false position. More probably it was by becoming *dissatisfied* with the true theory, because it did not afford scope enough for extravagance—because it did not open the way to extremes. Nothing will do for the empirical school of reformers but the *ne plus ultra* of a possible push—right or wrong, reasonable or unreasonable, good or bad. It is the profit of the trade—the love of power—the intoxication of an influence, which they feel to be in their hands. The original aim of the enterprise was good; those who first engaged in it did so from the purest motives; they have been sustained by

the virtue of the community; but, having obtained public confidence, borne aloft on the shoulders of a virtuous and confiding people, new prospects and visions of influence and power have opened before them; they have become giddy with the temptations of their unanticipated eminence; and the simple purpose at first contemplated is now unsatisfactory. They have declared new discoveries; proposed new theories; enlarged their plan; and appealed to the public to sustain them in the achievement of a mighty and glorious work—to resign to them a field which has opened upon them only by degrees, and the present prospects of which had not originally even gleamed upon their ardent imaginations! They set out under the banner of Temperance—would that they had been satisfied with that! next came abstinence, limited; next, total abstinence from meats as well as from drinks; and they now propose to teach mankind how to live without eating or drinking; for the non-eating theory is the natural child of the non-drinking. He who dissents from their opinions is proscribed as a heretic; persecuted as an enemy of his race; and if they do not overtake and dispose of him, it cannot fairly be charged to their want of zeal and determination. For they have now got power, and the use of it is sweet.

But we must not lóse sight of the true theory of Temperance. The false positions of these empirical reformers are more than one. That they should still retain the name of Temperance men, since they

have totally changed their ground, or gone off from it, is wrong. They have not an item of principle that entitles them to it. Their only appropriate name at present is Total Abstinents—or, if more convenient, Teetotals. Much cannot be said in favour of the euphony of either of these terms; and we confess that we are totally ignorant of the origin of the second. Nevertheless, it has been applied, and is understood. Those who stand on the original ground of this cause are the only Temperance men, if we adhere to propriety of speech; and if the appropriate names could now be applied in common use, it would place each class in their true position. A name often has a great accidental influence, and such is the case here. The Teetotals, by assuming a name which does not belong to them, are in a great measure screened from a proper estimation.

We have stated that the true theory respecting the use of alcohol, diffused in drinks, is, that it is injurious only as a stimulant. That it is a poison, is not of course an objection; nor, indeed, is its stimulating power injurious, as a matter of course, and in all cases; it may even be useful as a medicine.

It is proper, perhaps, to say in this place, inasmuch as it is generally conceded that alcohol resides in fermented liquors, as well as in those artificial productions called ardent spirits, with a difference only as to amount, we are not confident that philosophy requires us to distinguish between the natural effect of an equal measure in one form

and in the other, when used in drinks. We are inclined, however, to the opinion, that there is a difference in its effect on the animal economy in these two forms. But it is affirmed, and not without reason, that the majority of wines are charged with the naked form of alcohol, for the purpose of a better preservation. For the present, therefore, we shall not insist on distinguishing between alcohol in wines and in ardent spirits.

It is, then, as is evident, the stimulating effect of alcohol upon the animal economy, that is injurious. But on what contingencies? and in what cases? Let it be observed, that but for the danger of acquiring an unnatural appetite for this stimulant by the habitual use of it, and the ruinous excess that is naturally consequent, it is probable that nobody would have discovered it to be an evil, any more than the common nutriments conveyed in food. There are few who do not occasionally eat too much, and who are not injured by it. Many habitually eat to excess, and shorten their lives. This evil, however, is so trivial, compared with the excessive use of alcohol, that no society has yet been got up to prevent gluttony. But the habitual and excessive use of alcohol has in fact committed great ravages in society. There is no proof, however, that the moderate use of it in fermented liquors, or even in distilled forms, has been injurious, except as a temptation to excess. It is proper to allow all the force of the argument that can be raised on this condition, which, it must be confessed,

is not trivial. There is undoubtedly danger—and great danger, in this temptation. It has been maintained, with great truth and force, that temperance in the use of alcoholic drinks is always the mediate stage to intemperance, where the latter has followed.

It must be conceded, then, that it is not the use of alcoholic drinks in all cases and in any case, that is destructive; and we are not aware it can be proved that it is commonly injurious, except as leading to excess. We come, then, to the plain, common-sense view of the question—that it is the use of alcoholic drinks *in excess* which is injurious. The philosophy of the injury is obvious on the theory propounded—that the habitual and excessive stimulation of the animal economy by this means is destructive, because we find it always proves so. Neither is it any less true, that the moderate or temperate use of alcoholic drinks is not destructive, if we are to be guided by observation. We do not, in this place, say it may be beneficial; it is enough that it is innocent. We believe, and probably all will admit, that but for the intemperate use of alcoholic drinks, or its excesses, the Temperance reformation would never have been assayed; but the world would have gone on without imagining that alcohol is an evil; and that, too, probably in the best state of society. There is much more reason to suppose, in such a case, that eating, as very generally practised, would have been an occasion of reforming attempts. What,

then, would probably have been the state of the public mind, on such a supposition, in relation to the use of alcoholic drinks, we hold to be a pretty fair estimate of the natural effect of such moderation; certainly a much fairer rule than the wild and extravagant theories which the Temperance reformation has brought forth, because it would be a sober and common-sense view.

Alcoholic drinks have been in use in all ages, and in all ages have been abused. Their use is recognised in the Old Testament Scriptures, but not prohibited. Surely, on the principles of the Total Abstinents, our Saviour, at the marriage in Cana of Galilee, should have turned the wine into water, instead of turning the water into wine. It is impossible to justify that transaction on such principles. It would seem that when Christ's mode of living was compared with John the Baptist's, he was called "a glutton and wine-bibber," because he came "eating and drinking;" because, doubtless, he ate and drank as other people did, and drank wine. If wine can in no case be beneficial or lawful, according to the doctrine of the Total Abstinents, then was Paul decidedly wrong in his prescription to Timothy: "Drink no longer water, but use a little wine for thy stomach's sake, and thine often infirmities."

We have no proof, nor even an intimation, that the abstinence of John the Baptist and his severity of living resulted from any other cause than an

ascetic temperament—a personal and accidental inclination, such as has characterized thousands of other sincere and devoted religionists of the monastic class, from that day to this. The fact that it was predicted does not determine its character as commendable or otherwise, any more than any other subject of prophecy, which may be good or bad—a vice or a virtue. It was fixed upon as a distinguishing mark, by which John might be recognised, and proves the record to have been inspired. It is safer to take the life of our Saviour as a pattern in this particular, than that of his forerunner and herald.

It is remarkable, that one of the vows of the Jesuitical school was abstinence and severity of living. This has ever been a prominent feature in the monastic life, that has run through almost the whole of the Christian era; and is universally acknowledged to have been a vice—injurious to society, and prolific of incalculable evil. No one will doubt, except the present abstinent theorists, in company with the monks of the Papal Church, that the Apostle Paul had, along with other things, this specific vice in his eye in the following remarkable prediction: "Now the spirit speaketh expressly, that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits and doctrines of devils; speaking lies in hypocrisy; having their consciences seared with a hot iron; *forbidding to marry*, and commanding *to abstain from meats*, which God has created to be received with thanks-

giving of them who believe and know the truth. *For every creature of God is good*, and *nothing to be refused*, if it be received with thanksgiving." The abstinence of the monkish habits and that enjoined among us at the present time, for aught that can be seen, are the same thing, and result from the same principle. Ours began with a pretext of private and public good; so did theirs. Ours began with drinks, and had much plausibility in it. Next, as was natural, it proceeded to meats; and abstinence from the latter, now, as is well known, is nearly as prevalent as the former. Although there has not yet been formed a national society to support it, public lecturers are overrunning the country, and some of the wisest heads are constantly falling into the ranks of dupes to this theory. The vow of non-eating might be expected to follow the vow of non-drinking; and the tendency that way seems to be augmenting. They have not yet "forbidden to marry," but we are credibly informed—we believe the fact—that attempts have been gravely set on foot in the city and neighbourhood of New-York—how much farther we know not—to obtain written pledges from the sisterhood of married ladies to prevent the design and uses of matrimony in their relation to their husbands! If our readers do not recognise, in all these forms of applying the modern abstinent theory, the picture drawn in the above extract from an inspired hand, we know not how to help them to it more distinctly.

In the opinion of the author, the whole system of the Temperance reformation, as now managed, is upon a false basis, and conducted on principles which are rather injurious than beneficial to society. It is upon a false basis, because it assumes that all alcoholic drinks, and in every degree, are injurious and unlawful. It is contrary to Scripture and experience; it is supported by sophistry and false theories; and it cannot prevail. It is admitted, that by the operations of accidental and transient causes, this doctrine has acquired much influence in the public mind; but it is impossible that men should not ultimately think for themselves. Great numbers have been forced upon ground from which there must necessarily be a recession. The prevailing popular sympathy with ultraisms has favoured these compliances with extravagant and absurd measures; but such a state of the public mind must have its limit.

And not only is it impossible that a reformation having such a foundation should prevail, but the principles are injurious to society. They trust nothing to the virtue, to the moral strength, to the self-respect of the community, they leave nobody the keeping of his own conscience, or the use of his own judgment. Like some theologians who preach total depravity in such a form, and drive it to such an extreme, that the poor sinner can no longer respect himself, nor be respected, even for his amiable instincts, or for any other quality; so these temperance reformers will not

allow that a man can put his hand to a glass of wine without exposing himself to die a drunkard! It will not do—no, not a single glass of wine! We have actually seen men who, under the influence of these principles, have so utterly lost all confidence in their own virtue, and in the virtue of their species, as to become nervous, not only at their own narrow escape from utter ruin, because they could recollect the time when their fathers used to pass round the cheering glass through the ranks of their families; but also at the peril of the human race, wondering that all mankind have not died in a heap as drunkards, with nobody to bury them! But this prostration of self-confidence, this annihilation of self-respect, which is the destruction of one of the strongest foundations of private and public virtue, is not the only mischief produced by these principles. It is not enough that these aspirants for dominion have thus reduced the public mind in subjection to themselves, by undermining its self-reliance, but they are not satisfied till they have got the consciences of the public in their own pockets, and put their judgments under mortgage! For what else is the Temperance pledge? Who that has put his name to such an instrument can say that his conscience is in his own keeping, or that he is at liberty to use his own judgment?

Besides, we object to the manner of obtaining these pledges:—It is artful—it is compulsory. The demand—for demand it virtually is—is made

in such circumstances, and under such influences, that not one in ten, probably not one in a hundred, could avoid yielding to it, however they might desire to escape. They are literally dragged to the sacrifice—immolated on the altar that is built before the eye of the public—and, having once submitted, there is no more to be said; the triumph is complete; the victory is proclaimed; and the moral influence of the publication is, to draw and force other reluctant thousands into the same snare. Never was a system of tyranny better organized—or more efficiently executed. The victims are bound—there is no escape. Conscience, and reason, and judgment, are all taken away. Not even the privilege of self-respect remains; but deep mortification. Was ever a bondage more cunningly contrived—more effectually secured?

But, "we have the doctors' opinion," say these reformers, "that all alcoholic drinks are bad—and a host of doctors certify to the same theory. We have science to support us—and facts." We are sorry to have reason to declare the conviction, that these verdicts are not worthy of all that respect that is claimed for them; that some are from the ignorant; some from the ambitious; and that other some have been rendered from we know not what motives. We are sure that the most skilful medical men in the community have pronounced, and are ready to pronounce, on their conscience, that the Temperance reformation is a system of quack-

ery. Nothing is more evident, if a universal specific be quackery. In the creed of a Teetotal, alcohol accounts for all disease, and abstinence is a cure-all; it accounts for all disorders in society, and abstinence is the grand specific for reformation; and the consummation of the extravagance would be, and scarcely at all surprising, that alcohol was "the forbidden fruit" which "brought death into the world and all our wo;" and, consequently, that abstinence from it will restore mankind to their primitive state before Adam's first sin. We doubt not that this theory will prosper well when once allied firmly and indissolubly to its cognate ramification, total abstinence from all kinds of flesh that walks or creeps on the earth, or flies in the air, or swims in the deep—if fish can be proved flesh, which, doubtless, can easily be done by these empirics. Then we shall have "another gospel;" shall want a new Bible; a new version of the fall of man; and shall, doubtless, have a "panacea" for all evil, physical and moral.

To be serious—and most serious. Our spirits are too much oppressed with the weight of this subject to dismiss it in playfulness. We have seen the Temperance reformation grow into an immense and most influential system of empiricism, overrunning the community, and undermining the health and lives of our citizens to a most alarming extent; we have seen it, not satisfied with proscribing every exciting drink, however mild its character, for all persons, in health or sickness, and

thus interfering with the appropriate province of one of our most important and useful professions, but issuing its mandates, and setting up its public lectures, against the use of flesh as an article of diet.

It is not for the author to say that a simpler mode of living than what has generally been practised would not be better. Time has been when he has thought so; and, notwithstanding the ravages committed by Temperance societies, as organizations based upon empirical principles, he still thinks so. He has once been inclined to adopt the theory, that the simplest sustenance of infancy would be sufficient and best for man in every stage of life; at least, that a system of diet limited principally to milk and vegetables, provided it should be practised from the beginning of life, would prove more beneficial to our physical and moral constitution. But the results of late experiments over the wide community have made him wiser, and increased his respect, not only for the orders of Divine providence, and the evident suggestions of the inspired records, but for the customs of society in all ages.

In the first place, as an item of experience, having been visited with a form of dyspepsy, so called, in consequence of studious and sedentary habits, and receiving some hints from these knowing ones, the author began to speculate and philosophize on diet and drinks, till he had wellnigh philosophized and speculated his mortal body into

the grave. At last, being better advised, he began to eat what was set before him, asking no questions, taking care to have a due amount of physical exercise, and to live as other people live, who had never been enlightened by the doctrines of abstinence. The consequence was, that, in a reasonable time, he attained the enviable condition of not knowing that he had a stomach; that is, to the state of perfect health.

Next, as a subject of observation, there arose in the land a lecturer on dietetics, who, having most successfully philosophized himself out of the little health he once enjoyed, and ruined his constitution by abstinence, was able to tell all manners of ways by which he passed from one bad state of health to another, sometimes less bad, but generally worse. He who had never known what health was, or having been so long deprived as to have forgotten, undertook to tell the world how to recover it when lost, and how to keep it when gained. Of course, it was by dieting; the very way to destroy a good constitution, and undermine a good state of health; and ordinarily, though not in all cases, the sure way of preventing the return of health. Doubtless there are forms of clearly developed or lurking disease, that may be abated by dieting; but health can never be confirmed by it. Wise physicians understand this, and practise accordingly. The lectures on dietetics referred to—profoundly prolific of disease—were published, became popular, and doubtless made their scores

of victims. But the pecuniary benefit accruing from the said lectures was worth something.

Next, the author began frequently to encounter ghastly human countenances and cadaverous forms, praising electricity and galvanism, commending the rubbing of the surface of the skin with silk, or lauding the brush, with proper and scrupulous care in the way of dieting; and averring that man might live by galvanism alone, without eating or drinking. "Look you!—Doth it not make a dead frog jump? and will it let a living man die?" But, when these encouraging specimens of such practices had gone from his presence, in spite of their cheering philosophy, his spirits sunk down many degrees below nothing. They might be happy themselves, but their society had not in it the secret of making others happy. They were so nerveless—so vigourless—their very appearance, take it all in all, was enough to admonish one of the grave, and of all that follows. The land was soon filled with these ghostly preachers of dieting, galvanism, &c.

Next came the Temperance Society, the natural product and consummation of these philosophizings, combining the most essential ingredients of all. It was, perhaps, more simple, and less unapprovable, in the outset. The evil it had in view to correct was confessedly a great one. But these seeds already sown, this leaven so widely diffused, could not be kept out of it. They were its beginning, its life, its soul, its power—its sum and sub-

stance. A great society, after the fashion of the time, with all its complicated and vast machinery; with wealth at its disposal, and influence to sustain it; with innumerable pens ready for use, and tongues convulsed with spasms of zeal, was only necessary to give the finish to this system of quackery; and that finish has been fully realized.

It is true that intemperance had become a great evil in the land, and called for a remedy—although the evil has been greatly exaggerated by the customary extravagance of detail and representation. Neither is it any less true that the general health of our community is too frail to bear the severity of the method of cure. The medicine has been prescribed to those who are not visited with the specific disease; it has been used by proxy. The penalty for the fault has been inflicted on the guiltless. Those who were labouring under other innocent and unavoidable complaints, and whose only hope was a course of good and generous living, have been forced into the grave by depletion and abstinence. To save the guilty, the innocent have been martyred. To rescue the drunkard from death in the ditch, whose end would be regretted not as a loss to society, but only on his own account, virtuous and useful members of the community, being in a frail state of health, have been compelled, by an absurd and empirical theory, into a dietetical regimen, which must as necessarily be fatal to them as drunkenness is to the sot. By

this time it is getting to be known extensively, that multitudes have died and are dying of sheer famine —without any kind of disease—as the practical result of the abstinent system! Enfeebled in health from some other cause—though this alone is often sufficient—they have been drawn into the current of the Temperance reformation; have heard the lectures, and read the tracts; have believed; have abstained from flesh—from tea and coffee, it may be—and dieted sparingly on vegetables; have regarded all alcoholic drinks, wines, &c., as poisons, according to the Temperance creed, and have avoided them as such; and the consequence has been, that they have become nervous, enfeebled in mind, wasted away, and in many cases died without disease! Who can look up, and cast his eyes once around him, among the circle of his acquaintances, and not behold these victims—martyrs, fallen and falling? Were the statistics of this class sought for, collected, and shown to the public, with a fidelity like that which characterizes the labourers of the Temperance Society, bating all the extravagance of the latter, and exhibiting only the simple truth, we verily believe it would be made evident that the Temperance reformation, by its unsound theories and fallacious representations, and through its unrivalled influence, has killed more than it has cured!—killed the best, and saved the worst!—if it has saved any at all.

This statement we hold to be true, positively

and absolutely; first, because the reformation is by no means so great as has been pretended. The apparent suppression of the use of alcoholic drinks, socially and publicly—or the creation of a public sentiment so as to make it disreputable—has occasioned it to be taken extensively by stealth; and the habit of doing this out of sight will make ten, if not twenty, drunkards to one of an equal number that were accustomed to use it openly. The reason of this will be apparent and convincing at a single glance. In society there is a restraint—in privacy there is comparatively little. The general and prevailing opinion is, that there are as many drunkards now as before the Temperance reformation began; and this impression proves at least that the reformation proclaimed is not so obvious.

But, admitting that drunkards are less numerous than before—and the fact that it is a question shows it is difficult to be proved—the system of abstemiousness in eating and drinking—in other words, of starvation—which the false theories propagated by this society have been the means of introducing, is undermining the general health of the community to an alarming extent. It is well known that the health of Americans, or of citizens of the United States, is more frail than that of the English, Scotch, and Irish, and of Europeans generally. Probably about half of the population of this country are fit to be patients in the hands of physicians for one reason or another; that is, physicians might find in this moiety some defect of health or of con-

stitution claiming their professional attentions. We are a spare, gaunt, weakly race, rather requiring to be fed than to be put to fasting—needing rather a generous living than fitted to endure a severe regimen of dietetics. We have too little of blood; we cannot bear depletion. It is especially true, that the more weakly among us require to be assisted by tonics. Our professional men, particularly the clergy—the students of our colleges and higher seminaries in vast numbers, both of which classes are now being made the victims of Temperance quackery on a most extensive scale—are the very men who, of all others, require that their drooping spirits and flagging energies should be sustained and invigorated by a course of living directly opposite to that which they are now so extensively pursuing under the abstemious regimen, at the dicta of the Temperance reformers. The instances of declining powers, both of body and mind, under this treatment, are now so common as to exhibit a truly melancholy picture. One can almost as certainly indicate a patient of this class, as of the opposite extreme of bloated sottishness. The beamless eye, the colourless countenance, the languishing aspect, the doubting, undecided manner, the general want of determination in purpose and of courage in action, are among the marks of that vis inertia and morbid spiritlessness which this modern doctrine of total abstinence, from meats as well as drinks, has stamped upon the countenance and character of so many of the worthiest mem-

bers of this Christian community—of men who might otherwise be expected to exhibit that full and high-toned healthfulness, which is so grateful to behold, so resolute and so efficient in action.

But if this were all, it would be little. That regimen of living which so affects the general health, invades life itself; and this very class of persons die, and are dying in great numbers, under the delusion that the cause of their premature mortality is the means of their living so long. The wide-spread influence of the false doctrines of the Temperance Society has brought the public mind under a bondage—under chains—from which there is no redemption for the subjects. The obstinacy of their opinions, like every fanatical error, is incurable. Common sense is driven entirely from the field; experience is worth nothing; and abstemiousness, both in meats and drinks, is the one universal solvent for all questions relating to all states of health—the one only empirical prescription. It is a mania, that has taken possession of the public mind; and a physician might as well throw himself in the pathway of an overwhelming torrent, as to give advice contrary to this general belief. Sensible members of the medical faculty are quite aware of their position in relation to this popular delusion; they know it must be humoured; they understand very well how it has been introduced and become prevalent: first, by very honest designs and earnest efforts for public reformation, set on foot by moral and religious reformers; next, by

obtaining certificates and vouchers of opinion from scientific and professional men, so called, and who, perhaps most of them, had very good motives for so doing, but less knowledge and skill than love for their kindred; but no small portion of whom may well be suspected of welcoming such means of distinction as could not be found in the ordinary track of their professional pursuits. Some have had opened to them, by this means, a lucrative field of public lecturing, by which they prove very satisfactorily that man's physiological construction was designed by the Creator, as is averred to have been the primitive habit of Adam and Eve before the fall, to live on a vegetable diet only; and when their disciples languish and die of famine, it is only the necessary sacrifice to the new course of discipline for the ultimate and general good of teaching men to live without eating. It is like an old doctrine of some of the religionists—living by faith only. It reminds us very forcibly of the rather stale and vulgar story, but very pertinent in this case, of the man who declared that he had succeeded in bringing his horse thoroughly under this regimen, viz., of living without food; but, in process of attaining this object, the old fool pined away, and one morning was found dead.

It is truly astonishing and melancholy, especially when we contemplate the practical results, that a theory so near akin to this applied to the horse should be so extensively palmed upon the public; and that it should be supported and advocated by

professed men of science, roving through the country as public lecturers! It is even humiliating, not only as a prostitution of an honourable profession, but as a proof of the liability of the public mind to be imposed upon. It is not without reason that America has been called the prolific garden of theory and experiment. Vain of our reputation and distinction in this particular, we seem to be as easily tempted to run wild as the sophomores of a collegiate course. If the spectacle had merely arrived at the point of being amusing, it might be innocent enough; but when it comes to invade our moral and physical energies, our health and life itself, on an immense scale, it is a serious concern. We have in this country, at this moment, men and women, old and young, by scores and thousands, who are daily falling victims before the prevalence of this theory. It may be seen anywhere and everywhere—in the house and by the way, at home and abroad, in the college and in the kitchen, in the demure divine and in the plodding farmer. The community are becoming nerveless, spiritless, and ready to perish; and we deem it neither extravagant nor untrue to say, that the Temperance reformation, by its absurd and pernicious theories, is doing more hurt than good—killing more than it saves. If it be true that it saves the drunkard, whom society can afford to spare, it destroys the man whose services society needs.

But besides this havoc of health, of good spirits, and of life, by this rigid system of abstinence, the methods employed by the Temperance reformers for the attainment of their objects are in several ways injurious to the moral and social condition of the community. It sets out with extravagance of statements, theory, &c., as a necessary means of exciting public attention; and this must not only be carried through to answer the end, but it must be increased proportionately with the tendencies of a popular and morbid interest to flag, till the writer, lecturer, hearer, and reader, are all landed on false premises. For example—300,000 drunkards in the United States, 30,000 of whom die annually—which, of course, to keep the number good, must have an annual increment of 30,000. But who is a drunkard? Why, a man that drinks wine, or cider, or beer, as he can afford, daily, at his table; and especially the man who uses ardent spirits habitually, but temperately, as most of our fathers did a generation since, and died without a stain upon their reputation. The author does not commend the practice even of what used to be called the temperate use of ardent spirits; he is as stoutly opposed to it as any Temperance reformer; he only states the fact that it was once used habitually by parents and children, and so controlled as not to be generally injurious, as then esteemed. But all these, at least a large fraction of them, must be set down on the list of drunkards, to make it complete —startling—300,000! In other words, the com-

munity must be libelled, and its moral sense shocked, the discovery of which comes in afterward to increase the evil by shocking public confidence in all statements of the kind, and thus inflicting a grave wound on public morals. The social state of the community is always and necessarily injured by such extravagance.

Again: "It is *immoral* to make or vend ardent spirits," &c.—a deliberative and solemn decision of the Temperance Society. The author is not aware that they have excepted the making and vending of it as a drug for medicine, and supposes they would not make such an exception, as one of their theories denies that it can in any case be useful as medicine. If we rightly understand the common and popular meaning of the term *immoral*—and we must beg leave to say that the Temperance Society had no right to use it in any other sense—it signifies the violation of some specific and acknowledged law, divine or human, such as the laws against lying, cheating, stealing, &c. It must be a law *commonly acknowledged*, or some conventional rule of society established by general consent. But is this such a law? Who ever heard of it before? The fact that it is now propounded for the first time proves that it is not, and that the assumption of it is an extravagance. Or else it proves, what is perhaps to a considerable extent true, and therefore admits of some apology, that they who have so applied this term do not understand the common uses of language, and might

have found a more suitable employment than setting up as public teachers and reformers.

If they had contented themselves with proving on their own principles, and then pronouncing, that it is *constructively* wrong to make and vend ardent spirits, because it injures society, and is liable to injure our neighbour—and then left the appeal or remonstrance on an enlightened conscience—it would have been proper. But to depart so egregiously from the common use of language as to surprise and shock the public mind without convincing it, is itself as much an immorality as that which is involved in the charge under consideration. It is disturbing and confounding the conventional and fixed medium of intercourse between intelligent minds—a medium which, for public convenience and social purposes, ought to be regarded as obligatory on all scrupulously to maintain. But extravagance is characteristic of the operations of this society.

But there is a grand, radical, and thoroughly pervading principle of this society, which, in our judgment, is more at fault than any other; and without which, we confess, the society in its present form could not exist. We mean—the principle of the pledge. And we consider that the mode by which it is generally obtained is as exceptionable as the principle.

We maintain, that the tendency of the principle is radically and practically destructive of that per-

sonal virtue of self-reliance and self-respect, which is most important to be cherished, protected, and invigorated in the social state. God's providence and Christianity are evidently designed and calculated to make man strong in personal virtue—first, in the virtue of trusting in him that made him; next, in withdrawing trust from man, and mustering and cultivating the energies of self-reliance in relation to fellow-beings. There are certain social relations of dependance which cannot be avoided, and of which we are compelled to avail ourselves in the minority of our earthly existence, and in trying circumstances of late periods. Even these species and degrees of dependance are an evil, in themselves considered; and it is always made an effort, and regarded as a useful art in the economy of life, to relieve them, as far as possible, by preparing the subjects for independence.

There is a false and morbid intimacy and mutual dependance cultivated by certain religionists, which has probably led to this no less morbid and enervating reliance of the Temperance pledge. Admit that all men are not strong enough to be put upon their own virtue in regard to temperance in eating and drinking, under the ordinary restraints of society and motives of self-love, with all the light of truth and obligations of conscience bearing upon them, shall we undermine one of the strongest safeguards of general society, by introducing an artificial and unnatural relation, not only to protect and foster a defect and vice in these few, but to im-

plant and nurture the same defect in the many? He who subscribes to the Temperance pledge confesses his own weakness, and libels his species. The confession, being public, reacts, first, in a sense of shame and mortification; next, in self-distrust; till the unhappy subject finds his self-reliance giving way, and the keeping of his conscience, the use of his judgment, and his personal virtue in regard to this matter, all passed over by covenant into the hands of others. He is no longer a man in this particular that can respect himself, or be respected, except in that society which is attempting by force to make that appear a virtue which is a vice; and even then, to a great extent, it is a satisfaction which arises from the principle that misery loves company;—and, being committed to a bad cause, they resolve to make the best of it.

And not only is there this undermining of public and private virtue by the Temperance pledge, but generally it fails to answer the purpose intended on those for whose benefit it has been introduced. There are very few instances where those who cannot be saved without it can be saved with it. There is reason to believe that the number is too small to merit a consideration to be contrasted with the evils of the pledge.

But again, the mode most generally in use to obtain the pledge, is in a manifold sense deceptive and injurious. The great majority are forced reluctantly into it by ingenious contrivances in the arrangement of circumstances, and by the influence

of authority. The consequence must necessarily be a secret disgust and disrespect, and no less ingenious contrivances on the part of those who have been thus caught, to evade the obligations of their engagement. Here is immorality downright—unqualified; and immorality on an extensive scale, occasioned, caused, we may say, by this attempt at public reformation! If the statistics of injury done to public morals by this single cause could be made out and laid before the public eye, we believe they would present a frightful picture.

And yet, again, the results of this imposition are greedily seized and trumpeted round the land, as the glorious victories of the Temperance reformation; and thus the influence of one deception begets another, and another, and yet another, till the public are overwhelmed with a false show. It is possible, and not improbable—there is much reason to believe—that this much ado has actually diminished the quantity of ardent spirits used in the land; but it is no less true, that this diminution is owing principally to the abstinence of those who in most cases would have used it with impunity. This is enough to account for the difference, while secret drinking has been increased beyond estimation, and that practice is the most dangerous of all. Ten men will be lost who drink secretly, while nine of them would probably go safely through the ordeal, if public opinion allowed them to drink ardent spirits openly, at their own discretion, as in former years, under the usual restraints of society; so that the diminu-

tion of the quantity of ardent spirits actually used in the wide community, is so far from determining a corresponding decrease of intemperance in existing circumstances, that drunkenness may have actually increased in proportion to the decrease of the quantity of intoxicating drinks in the country.

The following notice, however, which has just fallen under the author's eye, in the New-York Journal of Commerce, of August 15th, 1836, would seem to show that he has allowed too much for the actual diminution of ardent spirits; or, at least, that the manufacture and trade are reviving in despite of the Temperance Society efforts. And it is not surprising: "WHISKEY DISTILLERIES.—The number of these establishments has a good deal increased in this city and neighbourhood within a few years past, stimulated by the high profits of the business. In New-York, Brooklyn, Williamsburg, and Jersey City, are 15 distilleries, at which are consumed not less than 10,000 bushels of corn and rye daily—or 3,000,000 annually."

But we will not presume that drunkenness has increased; suppose only that it has not abated, which is the common prevalent opinion, even among many of the Temperance reformers. What, then, is the benefit acquired by the public? Obviously nothing, while all the other disadvantages to society above enumerated and described, with others which might still be named, have been entailed upon us. The entire failure in this main point, and these unhappy results in so many other

directions, are fairly attributable to the unsound principles, false theories, and unwarrantable measures which have characterized the Temperance reformation.

What, then, is to be done? Abandon the Temperance reformation? The wheels of such a machine are not so easily stopped. The design—and so far as the public generally, who have fallen in with it, are concerned, the effort—has been to reform. No doubt the community has been moved to this work by heat and overstrained endeavour; by extravagant statements; by unsound and fallacious arguments; by various methods not to be approved by a sober mind. But attention has been excited, and public virtue called into action, on an important subject; and as much as we have reason to lament the course that has been pursued by the leaders in this cause, and the disastrous influences that have been cast abroad upon the community, there is yet sobriety and sound judgment enough in the public mind to correct these errors, to place the Temperance cause upon a safe and sure footing, to carry on a reformation that shall be salutary, and, in the end, answer all the purposes that are to be desired. Much light, as well as much darkness, has been thrown around this subject by the discussions with which the press, and other modes, have so abundantly teemed; and the darkness itself has served the purposes of light, inasmuch as it has placed truth and

error in an impressive contrast. The greater the extravagances, the more glaring has their character, as such, been revealed. These have been pushed so far as to have worried the public into the desire of relief. Thousands who have felt the chains, but who have not dared to make an effort to shake them off, are waiting with impatience for a period of emancipation. Well-wishers to the public in regard to the acknowledged evil of intemperance, and ready to support any hopeful projects of reformation, they have been forced, by circumstances contrived for them, unawares and reluctantly, into extreme, violent, and hurtful measures—which reflection has compelled them to disapprove, but from which they have not yet seen a way of being redeemed. Thousands of suffering, not to say dying invalids—wasting away and descending to the grave under the absurd and tyrannical dogmas of the abstinent system—forbidden the necessary sustenance of nature by principles which they themselves have hastily espoused, and by a declared public voice acting upon them from all directions—are waiting to be saved from the doom which seems to impend over them, if, peradventure, this reformation can be reformed, and a salutary direction given to it. The public voice declared in favour of this cruel system is now only a public feeling suppressed. It prevails only because of silence. Common sense is getting the better of imposture—is triumphing over fanati-

cism—and requires only the opportunity of being uttered to have sway.

This severe and painful ordeal will have its uses in a genuine Temperance reformation. There is no fear that ardent spirits will come again into credit, or into common use, as formerly. That cannot be. But we do not hesitate to declare decidedly against the use of the abstinent pledge. There is no point of view in which we can see it to be hopeful of good, whether we consult theory or observation; whereas, the sanction which it gives to impertinence, its inquisitorial tendencies, the direct and effectual blow which it strikes at personal virtue and the strength of individual character, its complete prostration of conscience and judgment as a private right, the disastrous consequences that have already resulted, and, above all, the door which it opens to the usurpations and despotism of a Jesuitical power, to be wielded *ex cathedrâ*—are grave and insurmountable objections to a practice so humiliating, and which has been forced upon the public by such unwarrantable expedients.

The only legitimate ground of any reformation whatever, in morals or religion, is :—Give us light—install and leave conscience in its own rightful place—put men on a sense of character and the motives of self-love—and let them be free.

We desire specifically, when speaking of the injurious and destructive effects of the abstinent system on health and life, not to be understood as having any exclusive or particular reference to the

prohibition of wine, &c., in all and whatever cases; but to a pestilent and infectious philosophy which has been set up in and over the community, in connexion with that doctrine; which pervades all the habits of the physical care and culture of our animal natures; which forbids the use of flesh, and attempts to reduce the diet of a hitherto well-fed people to perpetual fasting; which holds the wide community spell-bound under its power, as if they dared not even breathe the vital air which God sends over the land without leave of this other deity; and which, with all the terrors of authority, and with the iron hand of a despotic and murderous empiricism, haunts the footsteps of weak and declining health, and forbids all nourishment—guards the sick-bed of the languishing patient, and frowns away the approach of all kindness that would minister to the real wants of the case—and exults, with demoniac laughter, over the anguished face of the dying, that has at last become its victim. And, by the reign of this philosophy, death hath a continual feast.

There is a curious, instructive, and practical feature of morals, developed in the history and progress of the abstinent theory. We mean its effects on the temper—on the affections—to render the mind uncheerful, morose, unkind, and intolerant; and this is perfectly philosophical—the cause is apparent. Disappoint the stomach of its natural demands, and it will make any man churlish. There is an everlasting gnawing there which makes

him unhappy; which provokes him to look with an envy bordering on ill-will on all those who are not interdicted like himself, and who are satisfying the cravings of nature before his eyes. Misery loves company. Unhappy himself, he cannot endure that others should be happy. His uneasiness impels him to overstep the bounds of common civility, and he cannot allow his neighbour to eat a beefsteak, or drink a glass of wine, without inflicting upon him a lecture that shall take away the agreeable gust thereof. It is true he will have the pretence of a benevolent aim; but the secret impulse lies in the envious cravings of his own stomach, though he may not be aware of it. His habitual self-inflicted penances have imparted to his mind the green distemper; and if, peradventure, he has not the courage to be rude, he can indulge in slander, and insinuate, more or less publicly, that his neighbour is on the high road to intemperance. The thoroughly intolerant spirit of the abstinents, and their morose and illnatured manner, can hardly be accounted for on any other principle. Not allowing themselves meat and drink enough to be cheerful, they are envious at the cheerfulness of those who believe that "every creature of God is good, if received with thankfulness," and who are comforted by it. We have actually known persons, whose tempers were naturally amiable, become misanthropes in the abstinent career, whose society, while pining away in the last stages of starvation, was quite unendurable, and who seemed to be dying in a scolding-fit.

See *Note*, p. 291.

CHAPTER V.

The Jesuitical character of several moral and religious societies in our country, and the state of the community in relation to them.

It is impossible not to observe, in the progress and operations of the Temperance Society, a prominent and leading development of that spirit of Jesuitism which has of late been showing itself in various associations, professedly organized for the purposes of moral and religious reform. The beginning of all these enterprises is good—pure in motive, and commendable in their objects. So was the institution which owed its origin and character to Ignatius Loyola. It becomes, then, a grave and solemn duty, to inquire into the defects of those organizations which are so uniformly tending to such a result.

It has fallen within the range of the author's observations on society to notice these operations for several years. He was formerly, and for a long time, as earnest an advocate for these several institutions as any that have ever been or are now engaged in promoting them—not excepting the Temperance Society; and the latter would naturally have been one of the last for him to abandon, if he had not been thoroughly and conscientiously convinced of its inherent and essential faults. The

change of his views respecting these societies gen erally, has been as slow and unwilling as it has been irresistible.

The Temperance Society is an institution which, all must admit, began well in a good cause. It is true there was extravagance in the outset, as the institution, which afterward became the principal stock, was at first a mere offshoot from other enterprises, which were highly charged and powerfully influenced by that element. No new and special effort for moral and religious reformation, in these exciting times, can be made and sustained without being liable to extravagance. But the undertaking was an honest one, concerted and put in action, as we are disposed to believe, by honest minds. It went forward, extended its plans of operations, supported by the good wishes and concurrent aid of the public; and the virtue of the community, for the most part, is still with it. What good man could feel an opposition to so good a cause, so long as it might seem to be going on healthfully and prosperously to the attainment of its object? The public generally are not jealous of an enterprise of this kind, but confiding. When the current of public opinion in favour of any specific object, relating to the interests of society, is once raised, and rolls onward, it continues to roll. It is like the headway of a ship, bearing onward, with a powerful and almost irresistible momentum, even after the pilot may have seen reason for checking it, lest it should light on a shoal that lurks

under its way, or run upon rocks and be dashed in pieces. So has the Temperance reformation been borne onward by a favourable current and fair winds. Nothing has seemed to impede its course. The community, always honest in such a matter, have generally yielded to the statements and arguments of the society without examination. The cause was so obviously good, that the great body of the public have never troubled themselves to inquire whether it was managed in the best way.

It is pertinent to pause, in this stage of our discussion, and observe synthetically and analytically the parts and composition of this class of our reforming societies. As a matter of history, they have originated, in the majority of instances, independent of any general movement or consent of the public. The plans have been concocted by a few heads, and, with equal truth, ever afterward managed by a few. Like the school of Ignatius Loyola, if they have not vowed unconditional submission to a general-in-chief, the same principle has been virtually recognised and practised upon, by the admission of a select number of chiefs, who have taken the lead, and assumed a general, and, to a great extent, irresponsible control. In all such organizations one uniform result is very sure to be accomplished, viz., that the unexpected possession of power and influence, on an extended scale, over the public mind, gradually supplants the first movements of pure design in those thus invested, and admits, as a governing principle, the love of power

for its own sake. From a sincere zeal for the cause in which they had first enlisted, they pass to a mixture of ambition and the original element; next, to more than a balance of the baser quality; till at last, finding themselves in possession of the field, the temptation to assume an absolute control is too strong to be resisted. Having gained this ascendency, all things are shaped according to their own will, and in their own wisdom. A pretension of adhering to the original plan must of course be kept up, and also satisfactory appearances. Reasons for innovations must be shown to be well founded. In the meantime the public are unsuspicious, till finally the whole system of operations is accommodated to the ambitious designs of a few, who have usurped the powers as their own which were only yielded to them in trust. From a purely benevolent institution, based upon humane motives, or the higher aims of religion, as the case may be, the association is gradually converted into an engine of power, and the policy henceforth is to retain and augment these advantages, under the appearance of pursuing the original purpose.

It is allowing too much credit to human virtue to suppose, that the resignation and grant of power, on the part of the public, to a set of men who had not been accustomed to it, will be declined; and history abundantly demonstrates, that no class of men are so easily tempted to abuse their influence, if left uncontrolled, as those who set up for moral or religious reformers, under an enthusiasm so

ardent as to have blinded them to any distinct apprehension of the ulterior and ultimate stages of their career. They are literally in the wind of passion, and will be seen to veer and run as circumstances and fresh impulses may impel. It is not principle, but feeling, that guides them. From the common and sure bands of society they have been driven out into a romantic region, where law is to be adapted to occasions; and when the enthusiasm which first set them a-going has abated, they are a law unto themselves. To return voluntarily is not natural; and to bring them back is alike impossible. If they find themselves in the possession of influence, there is no knowing what use they will make of it, because, having forsaken the common ground of the social state, and the long-recognised principles of Christianity, they are left to the dominion of extemporaneous motives, and, being men, cannot be expected to lose sight of those of interest. A morbid enthusiasm most naturally subsides into sordid passion; and ambition is the reigning motive of human conduct, when the mind has been led astray from the sway of pure principle.

We do not say, nor do we believe, that the leading chiefs of the Temperance reformation have themselves personally passed to this extreme of deterioration in principle: on the contrary, we admit that many, if not most of them, are pure and honourable men. But we cannot account for the strange and unparalleled career they have run

without detracting somewhat, and not a little, either from the single and pure design of benefiting society, or from soundness of judgment as to the best means of attaining that end. We are charitably inclined to the latter alternative, though we cannot separate from it a large ingredient of an overweening love of power. We can easily conceive how, being once and publicly committed on the basis of unsound principles, honestly but precipitately embraced, they have found it convenient, and apparently necessary, to go on; and how one error has begotten another, till the whole cause has become involved in a complication and concatenation of mistakes, from which there is no retreat except by desertion. That sensible, well-informed, upright men should have gone so far in such a career of extravagance, and, we may add, of folly—nay, of what might seem moral obliquity—of a daring that has not only intrenched on civil liberty and the rights of conscience, but invaded the sanctuary of religion and the sacraments of God—all to compass an end to which they had been rashly committed by assuming a false position and adopting absurd theories—may well be looked upon as extraordinary, and involving a grave responsibility, especially when it is considered that it has all been done under the professed design of reformation in morals and religion! It is impossible that common sobriety should not pause over the spectacle, and inquire into the motives of such apparent and infatuated obstinacy. We can conceive that the

phrensy of fanaticism should lead men to any extremes, however absurd and revolting; and we know that history is replete with such examples. But that a deliberative assembly of men, claiming the character and enjoying the credit of being wise and good, should solemnly lend their sanction to principles so radically subversive of social order, and encroaching on the prerogatives of Divine inspiration, by calling in question the propriety of its records and sacramental ordinances, is surely too bold a push to be quietly tolerated. That any fraction of the community, even though it be considerable, should have been persuaded to starve themselves to death, is at least partly their own fault; but they who have instigated them to such folly and madness are not to be acquitted of all responsibility.

But the highest offence of all is—(and one which demonstrates the justice of the charge we feel obliged to bring against the Temperance reformers, viz., of having illegitimately acquired and cruelly abused an overwhelming power)—that they who have dared publicly to dissent from these doctrines, and remonstrate against such proceedings, have been systematically and perseveringly pursued and hunted down by attempts to injure their good name, and thus destroy their influence. Having established their own standard of opinion, they have substituted that power in the place of argument, and cast the die of their superior prowess on such an expedient! The field of open and fair debate has been closed,

and to dissent is to be proscribed! Here is an open invasion of the rights of private judgment and of the sanctuary of private character!—an invasion which will doubtless, in time, be duly esteemed, and meet with its appropriate rebuke; for we cannot believe that the community is yet so abased as to consent to such an outrage on rights, which all but these aggressors are interested to defend.

The simple truth is, that while the public have reposed all confidence in Temperance reformers, nothing doubting of the truth of their statements, of the correctness of their doctrines, or of the propriety of their measures, the weight of public opinion has been forestalled, gained by stealth, and then abused. It has been taken for granted, that every one who would not fall in with the popular current thus created is opposed to reformation; and the last resort of this unlawful power has been to insinuate, that the reason and ground of opposition could only be, that, being addicted to intemperance, every dissident or remonstrant is too fond of his cups; or, that he has some interest in the trade of manufacturing or vending ardent spirits.

In nothing, perhaps, have the wiles, the intolerance, and the tyranny of Jesuitism been more manifest among us, than in the expedients invented and employed to bring and hold the public mind under the dominion of the Abstinent system. It has been a grand muster of strength for a great stake—the select experiment, as it was likely to be less objectionable and more popular than any other; and the

issue of the conflict is yet to be decided. If this storming of reason and conscience can once be carried; if the mind of the public can be effectually brought under, so that no one shall thenceforth dare to "move the wing, or open the mouth, or peep," then farewell to the rights of private judgment and of conscience. Already have the visitations of this influence so come upon us from all directions, and in all shapes, and with such a sway, that few dare say their conscience and judgment are their own, in regard to the matter under consideration. Even though we have before us the example of a Divine Saviour creating wine at a marriage-feast, to be drunk on that occasion over and above the customary provisions, and appointing it to be used in the Sacramental supper; although his manner of living, compared with the abstemious habits of his forerunner (the latter of which seems to have been a fair type of the doctrine of our Temperance reformers), subjected him to the charge of "gluttony and wine-bibbing," and would doubtless subject him to the same charge now; although we have an inspired apostle prescribing to the physical infirmities of an associate this forbidden and "poisonous beverage" —and much other Scriptural authority of the kind, when the record is fairly interpreted; and although we have the advice of experience and the recommendations of the highest professional skill, yet, under the regimen of our Abstinent reformers, of our Temperance quackery, the languor of physical infirmity is doomed still to languish; the craving

appetite of the famishing asks in vain for that sustenance which nature demands; and the victim, the martyr—and such martyrs are multiplying around us—sinks into the arms of death only for want of food and drink! We have seen them—who has not?—after having pined away for months and years under this system of self-immolation, dying in full faith of the principles, the practice of which has destroyed them. And it is only where a physician steps in, whose decision of character and moral courage are equal to his skill, and who dares to exclaim—"quackery"—over the melancholy spectacle that lies before him; and who, by the weight of his name and by his determination, prevails to rescue the sufferer, by enforcing upon him beefsteak and wine, that it is discovered, this was all he wanted; for disease he had not, but was dying of famine!

Far be it from the author to desire that the old habit of using ardent spirits should become common again. Thus far he allows that the Temperance efforts have achieved a victory. Nevertheless, the victory has been won, not alone by unfair means and by force, but at an expense of virtue, of health, and of life, which stand over against the benefit in the array of a fearful odds. And this is not all: the system has driven thousands into the habit of secret drinking, which, in the great majority of instances, is likely to end in their ruin; so that it remains at least doubtful whether the number of drunkards has been diminished. And it has by its

intolerance banished multitudes from the common pale of society, made them desperate, and cut them off from redeeming influences. Nearly all the advancements of the Temperance reformation have been forced—forced upon ground which cannot be maintained, because the public, when their eyes shall be opened, are not likely to submit to such a sway. The project of banishing wine, beer, cider, &c. entirely from society, is a wild and vain scheme; and yet the cause of the Temperance Society, in its present position and relations, is staked on this contingency. It goes for the whole, under the risk of losing the whole. Extravagance heaped upon extravagance has pushed it into an extreme, which can be maintained only by the perpetual accumulation and imposition of similar devices. Common sense, after all, will assert and recover its rightful dominion; the pride of self-government and the desire of self-respect cannot be annihilated, and will return with its claims; sobriety will outlive fanaticism; men will find that the best economy of society is, not to set every man a guardian over his neighbour, and commission him to hold perpetual inquisition over his private conduct and habits; but that every individual should stand upon the basis of his own personal virtue, panoplied with his own armour, be the keeper of his own conscience, holding the sovereign right and use of his own judgment, provided he does not encroach on the rights of his neighbour; and, in our opinion, they will find, moreover, that the machinery of the Temperance Society,

as now organized, is inconvenient, impertinently obtrusive, creating artificial relations in society, which must always work badly, and which are alike destructive of social happiness as of personal virtue and strength of individual character. Even now the public have become so dependant on this factitious system, so enervated by its chains, that, if set at once at liberty, they would hardly know how to govern themselves. We have even reason to fear they would run into wild and dangerous excesses. Like slaves, incapacitated for the care of themselves by the habits of a long-protracted bondage and subjection to a master's will, a sudden emancipation might be injurious.

The author is aware that the imputation of Jesuitism to this and some other associations of a kindred class, is a suggestion which ought not to be conveyed without good reasons. He does not, however, pretend, that it is a spirit of so heinous a character as that which actuated the school which gave birth to this name, in the height of its atrocities. He only means to intimate what he conscientiously believes, that associations originally organized among us under the motives of a commendable reforming spirit, have since discovered, in the height of their influence, that the public mind is susceptible of being subjected and swayed to almost any extent by institutions of this kind, artfully and skilfully managed; that the love of power has found a place with the spirit of doing

good, and corrupted it; that conscience has not always and alone been consulted in the projects of these societies, but rather, and to a great extent, the means of acquiring influence; that the extravagance of new doctrines and false theories has detracted alike from the wisdom and virtue of these institutions, and tempted their leaders into unwarrantable experiments; that for the attainment of their objects, they have found it convenient and advantageous to adopt and practise the arts of political combinations; that they have employed unworthy and bad means for good ends; that religious sectarism has been admitted to an improper influence, and extensively shaped their measures and controlled their operations; and that these and other faults have so vitiated these societies as to leave them deeply leavened with the appropriate spirit of Jesuitism, so far as the character of the age and the state of society will admit.

Besides the natural tendencies of such institutions to be corrupted, when left in the hands and under the control of a few individuals, the multiplication of rival organizations necessarily places them on political ground in relation to each other. Take, for example, in the religious world, the two great rival domestic Missionary Societies of the Presbyterian Church. Like two nations at war, all the skill and power of each is constantly put in operation, and brought to bear for the disadvantage of its adversary, and for its own success in such an opposition. It is reasonable and philosophical to

conclude, that a man of the purest spirit might enter as a leader and governor into the service of either of these societies, and in five years time turn out a managing, skilful politician in that specific province. From the love of doing good, he may have passed entirely to the desire of power and influence, and be principally occupied in contrivances peculiar to the policies of earth. The supervisory departments of such institutions, which are always of commanding influence, are positions of eminent temptation to more debasing schemes than ought to be found in such a quarter.

It is a remarkable fact, that in less than the period that belongs to a single generation, the economy of society in this country, in all that pertains to moral reform and religious enterprise, has been formed on a model entirely new to ourselves, but not without type in history. It is the assumption of a controlling influence by a few, who stand at the head of moral and religious organizations of various names. The public generally are simple, honest, confiding; and do not note operations of this kind. That is, they do not understand when and how the whole frame of society is getting into a new structure, leaving the great mass in subjection to the will and control of select, and often self-elected, combinations of individuals. They do not even suspect, that societies, formed for such good purposes, could have in them the leaven of ambition; and they allow themselves to be formed

into minor and subsidiary organizations, comprehending the whole mass of the community, to uphold these supervisory establishments by contributions drawn from every source and from every hand. Most extraordinary measures are devised to obtain funds; itinerating mendicants are flying in all directions, traversing the country from east to west, and from north to south; every part of the complicated machinery is well contrived to answer the end; the system is thorough and perfect; and at the head of all sit a few eminent individuals, looking down upon and managing this work of their own hands, themselves independent and secure in their places by provisions which cannot fail while their influence lasts.

The process of corruption—for such we think proper to call it, without pretending to measure its degrees—in these high officers, and in the societies under their control, is always gradual. The men come into these places ordinarily under the influence of very pure designs; it was, perhaps, an unexpected elevation; certainly there was neither experience nor custom in it; they are transplanted from a circumscribed to a wide sphere of action and influence; their views are expanded; their duties require them to travel, and to form extensive acquaintances with the public; they see the world in constantly new and shifting forms; are ever concerting and scheming for the attainment of their objects; the economy of social organization for these purposes becomes a study,

and themselves adepts; practice makes perfect; they enlarge their plans, and attempt to improve them; they attain, finally, not only a high and commanding position in society, but an almost unlimited influence; and "who," think they, at last, "can govern the world better than we? We have discovered how it can be done; we are competent; and we think it will be safest in our hands." And they set themselves about it, on the principle that all men have a right to that influence which they can command. They have no scruples; they have found out that the world must be governed by a few; that it is all effected by scheming; that perfect honesty and openness are inconsistent with such an art, and impolitic; that the secrets of government must be in the keeping of governors; that the wide public are to be informed only on points which concern them to know, and as they may be convenient instruments of power; that, in view of rival institutions, sects, or parties, all plans are to be formed and executed on principles of policy; and policy becomes, at last, the reigning principle. In spite of themselves, they and their work are transformed; they are not the things they were when they first set out. It is the unavoidable, the irresistible tendency of such organizations in such relations. It can no more be prevented than the course of nature, because it is identical with that course. These men will as necessarily become ambitious and aspiring, grasping at power and loving to wield it, and will as certainly

scheme for themselves, as the infant will come to be a man; and observing the scope, and feeling the motives, of the wide field before him, will make the most of it. And never was a community more effectually brought under this dominion than we are at this moment. It is a new form indeed; but it is the operation of the same principle. A few irresponsible societies, with a few men at their head, govern this land in all that relates to our moral and religious interests; and they govern it for themselves. At least, they govern it in a way that is agreeable to themselves; and such is the ascendency of their influence, that their will is irresistible. It is a revival of the reign of Jesuitism, adapted to our time and circumstances.

We think it fair to say, that the clergy generally, and the religious public, who have been drawn into these schemes, are most remote from any participation in unworthy motives. It is the perfection of such policies, that a few lead the many, and ride upon their shoulders—while the many are persuaded that their leaders are as uncorrupt as themselves. Nor would we intimate that, for the most part, these societies have not espoused interests of importance, and most worthy of support. Our diffidence relates entirely to the character of the organizations, and their inherent tendencies to corruption and abuse. The change we desire to see is not the abandonment of these interests, but that they should be restored to the control of that public that is called upon to support them.

If the clergy of this land and the Christian public will open their eyes, they will see that the interests of moral and religious reform in the country are, almost entirely, in the hands and under the control of a few combinations of individuals, who are themselves not only above any suitable control, and irresponsible, but who have devised and put in operation a system of measures, which, by their own supervision and that of their sub-agents, force the wide community, socially and individually, into their schemes, while the public have no voice in concerting them. The measures are not submitted, but imposed. In the present posture of these affairs, there is no chance for that general control which is the only safety of a community of rights and privileges. And the ascendency of these combinations is perpetually rising; this control is becoming more uncontrollable; by a consciousness of power they are growing more confident; and no man can openly oppose them without the risk of being crushed by their influence. Their eyes are everywhere; they see and understand all movements; and not a whisper of discontent can be breathed, but that the bold remonstrant will feel the weight of their displeasure. The whole community, on whom they rely, are marshalled and disciplined to their will.

However important, therefore, those interests may be which have thus accidentally fallen into such hands, and for the very reason that they are important, it becomes the solemn duty of the pub-

lic to see that they do not receive detriment on that account. Some of them have already been grossly mismanaged, and threatened with a complete wreck—such, for example, as the Temperance reformation. We do not desire to expose the faults we have noticed in the management of other enterprises, because we indulge the hope that they may yet be corrected; nor are we willing to diminish public confidence in them so long as that hope remains. Our principal aim has been to point out the defects and dangerous tendencies of organizations of a specific character, in the hands of which these interests are extensively vested, believing that they are radically and essentially Jesuitical.

CHAPTER VI.

The remedy.

We shall now proceed to the task, originally prescribed, of suggesting the remedy for the Jesuitism of these irresponsible associations, which, within a few years past, have sprung up so numerously, risen to such importance, and obtained such a sway in this land. No human foresight could have predicted such a perversion of the designs of these institutions—that they would have become the medium of aspiring ambition—and the grand instrument, in the hands of a few, of their own personal and party purposes. But it is too painfully obvious that such, to a very great extent, has been the result of this experiment; that the tendencies that way are rapidly and powerfully augmenting; that a pure zeal for the professed objects of these societies is dying away in the hearts of their leading agents and governors, and more sordid views taking possession of their minds. And, upon reflection, we discover that such consequences might have been expected; that it was requiring something more than human to endow a few irresponsible individuals with indefinite powers, or to allow them to usurp such powers, and hold and use them in their own discretion, and then expect that they

would serve the public, and the public alone. Men have never been good enough for such a trust; they are not good enough now.

But they who have reposed confidence in these institutions, and looked to them as the great reforming agents for the renovation of society and for the conversion of the world, will feel a grievous disappointment at such a discovery. So have we felt. Our spirits have been depressed—our faith in Providence has seemed to give way—as we have watched the deterioration in the character of these societies, and witnessed its progress. We have reviewed history, and studied the Bible; we have examined the structure, combinations, and operations of society, especially as it is affected by institutions of this class, that, if possible, we might find a solvent for this unexplained, difficult, and momentous problem. We have watched the peculiar, uneasy, and susceptible character of the age, and observed the powerful and irresistible tendencies to change throughout the civilized world, in politics, morals, and religion. The popular mass have discovered and felt that things are not right, and have been easily moved to favour any enterprise that promised to make them better. Political unions of various denominations, and among all classes, have been organized for the purpose of effecting political changes; in other words, to bring about a reformation in the structure of political society. The religious world has sympathized thoroughly with the prevailing spirit of reform, and

has not been inactive. Moral and religious organizations have sprung up with surprising rapidity, and some of them have attained to an amazing growth and influence. The fashion and modes of this movement have been, with little exception, uniform; and, upon the slightest examination, will be found to be based upon oligarchical principles. For celerity and energy in the execution of public affairs, there is nothing like intrusting government in the hands of a few; and an absolute monarchy is the most vigorous administration of all.

It is remarkable that the enterprises of moral and religious reform in this country have not only been assumed by a few, but that few have made laws for themselves and for the public. The whole fabric of society, in these matters, has, within a brief period, been revolutionized—or, more properly, perhaps, reconstructed on a new model;—and all this has been effected while the public were unaware of the change through which they were passing—at least, unapprized of the result to which they were tending. They have, indeed, been in some measure conscious of the career of change, and made to believe that all things were going on well; but, always honest and confiding, as the mass of the community are, when acted upon by such agencies, they have never dreamed of the domination aimed at by a few ambitious aspirants. Indeed, it is no more than justice to allow, that the oligarchical schemes now so obviously entertained by these leaders in moral and religious reform, and

in such active operation, were not probably indulged by themselves, to any considerable extent, at the commencement of these enterprises. They are the natural product and spontaneous growth of the system. "Is thy servant a dog, that he should do such a thing?" Men do not know what they will do when they shall have acquired influence; and, therefore, it is never safe to intrust them with power beyond what is necessary for the best ends of society, nor in any shapes which have not been dictated by the wisdom of experience, and confirmed by the public voice. Assumed or usurped power is the natural germe of disastrous consequences; and this is precisely the species of influence now under consideration. It has not been bestowed, but assumed; it is an influence that first insinuated its advancements, and then seized the sceptre.

Inasmuch, however, as the enterprises for moral and religious reform, which characterize the age, are in principle sound and praiseworthy; inasmuch as reform is important, necessary, and incumbent, till society, throughout the world, shall be securely and permanently established on the pure and unadulterated principles of Christianity; and inasmuch as public virtue, to a wide extent, has been called into action for this purpose by the efforts in question, as must be allowed, it only remains to bring and hold this awakened and commendable feeling under a safe guidance; and not only so, but to augment, cultivate, and carry it forward to

the grand result which Christianity contemplates. It is a most interesting feature of society in this age—a manifest development of God's wise administration of human concerns—that the public virtue of the community is susceptible of being influenced, and moved to efficient action, by the proposal of any apparently hopeful reforming measures. But it is no less true that the public, as a body, are not competent judges at first sight of the expediency of any specific and new measures of reform that may be recommended to their patronage and support. They desire the object, and are ready to join in the enterprise. Here is a providential basis, secure, firm, to be relied upon; but the specific social organization, or form under which this virtue shall be brought to bear on the final issue, is a question of momentous importance. The grand result, contemplated and aimed at, depends on this determination. If the form be right, the end will be secure; if wrong, it will be a failure, more or less disastrous.

We come, then, to the grand specific:—Christianity, with its divinely appointed agencies, is ordained to be the great reforming power for the world. Jesus Christ gave a commission to a select society, by the principles of which, in their hands, and through their instrumentality, accompanied by the efficacious grace of the Holy Spirit, he designed to bring the world in subjection to himself. It is now full eighteen hundred years since this com-

mission was bestowed and taken in hand; great expectations have been indulged by the action of its powers from that day to this; society has undergone multitudinous changes where it has been applied, affected more or less by its influence; but scarcely anywhere has it worked in its own proper way, except in the hands of the apostles, who, embarrassed in the task of breaking ground as pioneers of the Christian system, were, of necessity, limited to a brief, though brilliant career —to a few, yet splendid triumphs. *They* worked on the principles of their commission; they expounded those principles; they filled out the sacred canon; passed over their responsibilities to the hands of successors; and left the inspired records, thus complete, in the hands of such agents, to make their own way in the world to a final and unrestricted triumph.

As believers in revelation and in the scheme of Christianity, we receive and maintain that these records, in company of the great commission, are designed and adequate to renovate human society thoroughly; to make man all that is most desirable; to exorcise his vicious propensities, or so to modify and control his intellectual, moral, and physical powers, as to produce a state of society answering to the Christian theory of the millennium, when properly understood. We pretend not here to explain that theory; nor do we conceive it important. It is enough to believe that it will be a state of society corresponding with the high pre-

tensions and declared aims of Christianity—a universal reign of righteousness and peace.

We receive and maintain, that the actual failure of Christianity hitherto, in not having produced this result, is not to be ascribed to its defects, or to the inadequacy of its principles and powers. Nevertheless, as a matter of fact, it has failed under the protracted experiment of eighteen hundred years; and we are compelled to look for the reasons in other quarters. The history of Christianity is before the world; and, as an item of its history, it will be observed that, among its sincere and sanguine disciples, there has always been prevalent an expectation that its grand and ultimate triumphs were about to dawn upon the world. That expectation was indulged even in the apostolic days, as appears from the inspired records, and was corrected by an inspired hand. It has ever been cherished, to a considerable extent, by enthusiastic believers. It is cherished now. It has been confidently predicted, that the very movements which it is the task of these pages to notice and criticise, are destined speedily to usher in the grand millennial period so long waited for. Ignatius Loyola supposed that, in the organization of the Jesuitical school, he was preparing the way for the immediate subjugation of the world to the papal dynasty, and his successors seemed for a while to have a fair promise of attaining that end. With Loyola there was comparatively a purity of purpose, and, for aught that can be shown, a purpose commend-

ably pure. Francis Xavier had the same faith, and so, doubtless, had many others. They expected a millennium of their own type. Interesting and hopeful of good as are our modern Protestant missions among the heathen, there have never yet been any so efficient, so successful, or so influential, as those which have emanated from the papal throne. We are neither the advocates nor the apologists of that mixture of worldly policy which has characterized the proceedings of papal emissaries in different parts of the world; we speak only of the fact of their success. They have carried their triumphs, not only into the lower, but into the higher regions of society. They have always aimed, and not unfrequently made their way, to the thrones of princes, and to control the councils of heathen tribes. Rammohun Roy is almost the only convert of high caste and distinguished talent to certify to the success of Protestant missions among the superior grades of heathen nations.

We have no desire to detract from the importance of Protestant missions among the heathen. On the contrary, we consider them most worthy of support. But we cannot conscientiously be accessory to the conviction endeavoured to be fastened upon the public, that any considerable impression has yet been made in any quarter on the domains of paganism, if we except the reported success of the London Missionary Society in the South Sea Islands, which, it is now understood, has not sustained the original expectations; and also the more

recent achievements of the American Board in the Sandwich Islands, over which a cloud has already risen to darken their prospects. The proper test of the success of Christian missions is a permanent impression made on the regions of civilization, previously devoted to idolatry, such as was effected by the ministry of the apostles over the Roman empire and elsewhere; at least, that we might hear of converts from among the higher castes of semi-barbarous nations, and from among men of superior intellectual culture. The fact that none of this class, except Rammohun Roy, have yet returned from pagan ground to show themselves on the heights of Christianity, as trophies of modern Protestant missions, is a fair indication of the meager fruits of these efforts. This, however, only tends to show, first, that there has been a hasty and indiscreet proclamation of success; next, that higher and more vigorous efforts are required; and lastly, to suggest the inquiry, whether modern missionary schemes are, on the whole, most suitably devised and most wisely managed. Either there is some defect in the system, or else expectations have been too high, and the public deceived by false reports. In our own view, the success of these enterprises has been altogether satisfactory, considering all the obstacles and the character of the agencies employed. Our principal objection is to the want of frankness in reporting things as they are, and to a disposition to raise unwarrantable expectations, as a basis of support. It is a Jesuitical practice. We consider,

moreover, that the plan and organization of modern Protestant missions are to a great extent defective, and require to be corrected and placed upon the basis of the primitive commission for the conversion of the world; and we believe that Providence is preparing the way for the attainment of this purpose, without detriment to what has already been effected—that the present effort is an incipient stage in the great work.

If, then, it be admitted, that Christianity is adequate to its professed design of reducing all nations to the dominion of its principles, we are compelled to find the cause of its failure hitherto in the neglect or perversion of the great commission. We think it lies in both. It has been perverted, as in the Papal Church, and in some of the Protestant ramifications, where Church and State have been blended; and it has been neglected, as in these modern organizations, tending to a Jesuitical character. In one and in the other, and in both united, we can see enough to satisfy us why Christianity has not prevailed, and cannot prevail, to the completion of its design, till its cause be based alone upon the original commission given by the Saviour, and put in operation and sustained by the apostles.

We assume, that the apostles organized a society under this commission, themselves acting as an authorized ministry at its head; and that this society is properly the Church, as commonly denominated. It will be convenient for our purposes to adopt the term Church, as designating this society, inasmuch

as universal custom has assigned it to this exclusive use. The fact that there is not a perfect uniformity in the meaning attached to it by all the Christian world, is a trifling disadvantage; nevertheless, we shall endeavour to make ourselves understood, as it is the best and most proper term we can propose.

We assume also that this society—the Church—has had a perpetuity of existence, though variously modified—sometimes in a great degree corrupted. The papal hierarchy, with its diversified fabrications and dependances, is an enormous—stupendous corruption; but yet, although attempts have been made to deny its claims to have the commission of Jesus Christ in its trust and keeping, that denial has not been satisfactorily sustained, in view of those who maintain a fixed and definite theory, as to the form and character of that commission. We mean, simply, that the baptisms of that church, and other ministerial offices common to them and to Protestants, are not ordinarly rejected by the latter; and that, if the Roman Church should ever be reformed and reduced to the simple foundation of the primitive form, there is no good reason why she should not be recognised as an integral portion of the Church of Christ, without being dissolved or required to be reorganized. The Greek Church has been corrupted scarcely less than that of Rome, and in some points more so; but we are not aware that Protestant Christians have entertained the idea or purpose of denying her claims to be a portion of

the Church of Christ; and we presume that this denial will never be made to any extent.

The Church of England, since she came out in favour of the doctrines of Protestantism, has yet been essentially vitiated by a connexion with the State. The history and character of this church, as Protestant, are peculiar. The change was not a schism, except in the light of the papal claims; which, of course, we do not regard as worthy of respect; but it took along the whole. It was the State which decreed the change, and not the Church, as such; and some advantages in this view have no doubt been gained by the union of Church and State in Great Britain. The State, having resolved upon that course, was able to defend and protect the Church in the exigency; otherwise her integrity must in all probability have been sacrificed. With all our objections, as Americans, to the union of Church and State, which are valid and reasonable—sound in theory and salutary in practice—we are incapable of estimating that union in Great Britain, unless we take into a dispassionate consideration the history of its origin and progress. It should be recollected, the union was formed and cemented under the papal dynasty; that Parliamentary legislation for the Church, previous to the Reformation, constituted probably a full moiety of the laws of the empire; that those laws were interwoven with the entire fabric of society, so that the union could not be instantly severed without dissolving the social state; that the Ref-

ormation was in fact a very essential and radical improvement, even in the light of that theory which is opposed to the union of Church and State, and a step preparatory to a final severance; that the state of society in Great Britain, by long custom, was fitted to endure that union in a modified and milder form, if not to profit by it in existing circumstances and for an indefinite period; that the tendencies of public opinion have all along been approaching the period of emancipation from the disadvantages of this union, and ripening for it; that recent measures of political reform in that kingdom have developed an urgent and influential bias of the public mind towards this result, so as almost to precipitate and force this change more rapidly and violently than a prudent regard to the public welfare would dictate; and that no doubt now remains, if a gradual and prudent reform can be carried on in Great Britain, without a revolution, as is likely to be the case, that all the evils of Church and State, with the connexion itself, will ere long be removed. It should be remembered, that Protestantism is not responsible for the formation of this connexion, but the Church of Rome; and that, ever since the Protestant Reformation, obvious and decided tendencies have been gaining force in the public mind for relief from this state of things. It may fairly be inferred from the lights of history for three hundred years, and more especially from events of recent date, that the principles of Protestantism are uncongenial with a union of

Church and State; and that the accidental continuance of that connexion in Great Britain has been forced upon that community by the occurrences of previous history. It is an undoubted truth, that the Church of England is even yet very essentially corrupted by this union; in other words, they have yet much to do before they can be thoroughly redeemed from the disadvantages into which the papal administration had involved them in the progress of many centuries. It is well known, that in consequence of the union of Church and State in Great Britain, appointments to the ministry of that church are by a very great majority in the hands of the king, nobility, and gentry; that such characters are not likely to have, and, in view of their interest in promoting family connexions and favourites to the more valuable livings of the establishment, do not in fact have, a scrupulous regard to the proper qualifications for the ministerial office, in the use of their prerogative of nomination. From this and other causes akin to it, all arising from a union of Church and State, it necessarily results, that the Church of England has in it a great amount of corruption. Nevertheless, it is improving rapidly in regard to these evils. Public opinion forces improvement upon it; it is unavoidable. That the Church of England is entitled to be recognised as a legitimate branch of the Church of Christ, we suppose will not be questioned by American Christians.

The Church of Scotland, under the Presbyterian name, has her faults, but is entitled to very

great respect. None, perhaps, has maintained a higher degree of purity since the Reformation; she has been, and still is, highly influential in the support of pure Christianity in the world. If she is faulty in the obstinacy of her character, as a dogmatic school, she has yet many redeeming excellences. We know not the Christian community which is on the whole more thoroughly exempt from blemishes in its moral character.

The Wesleyan Connexion of Great Britain and America, the date of whose existence is scarcely a century, but which, notwithstanding, ranks in number among the leading Protestant denominations, is perhaps as little obnoxious to criticism and public censure, in point of purity of character, as any Christian sect that can be named. The several Dissenting denominations of England—at least some of them—are worthy of high praise for the purity of principle, regarding moral and religious character, which they have maintained before the world. The grounds of their dissent have naturally produced this result—they having complained, not only of the oppressive operation of the Establishment, but of the want of an earnest religion in it, and set out to do something better.

The Protestant sects of the continent of Europe are worthy of a reference here. Holland and Germany excepted, however, they are not very commanding or influential. So little is said and commonly observed of the religion of Denmark and Sweden, that half of our well-educated people,

if surprised by the question whether they are Protestants or Papists, would perhaps be embarrassed. Geneva?—alas! her glory is departed. The amazing reaction, and the extreme from Christian orthodoxy, as commonly maintained, into which Geneva and Germany have been plunged, would seem to intimate, if we view the subject philosophically, that there must have been a great deal of violence and extravagance in the Reformation; and that the severity of character in the Reformers, both as dogmatics and as men, was too rigid to be altogether comfortable. None, however, but the most impassioned and resolute men could have done this work. They wore God's high behest to human society for the occasion. Nevertheless, it is proper for us to distinguish between their virtues and their faults, and not to think of canonizing them as absolutely perfect. Calvin's theology was doubtless, in some respects, extravagant; and Luther's career was violent. It could not be otherwise. The Reformers generally were involved in a tempest of human passion, and cast in the thickest fight of a great moral revolution, the result of which has changed the face of society, and opened new sources and channels of thought. But the sun of the Reformation sunk beneath the horizon, and left Germany involved in the darkness, mazes, and labyrinths of a new school of philosophy, from which they have yet to emerge.

But the Church of Christ was transplanted to these American shores,—has lived and flourished

here under different forms, until we have become a highly religious people. Indeed, it may be said, that we have been emphatically a religious people from the beginning. The American mind has been peculiarly active and prolific in theology and religion, as in all things else; and the different denominations of Christians among us have been more pure and more efficient for the time being than in any other part of the Christian world. Our state of society having been more simple, and the social connexions more intimate and compact, the facilities for the social influence of religion have been greatly multiplied. Our principal aim in this place, however, is to observe, that we have among us such important bodies of Christians as to entitle us to say, that the Church of Christ is here if it is anywhere.

What specific organization is essential to constitute the Church of Christ, is, of course, a question of diverse opinion with different classes of Christians. It is not important to our object to determine this point, or to have any thing to do with it. Without pretending to settle or discuss this question, we only propose to assume the ground of common popular opinion, viz., that the Church of Christ in America is composed of the different denominations of Christians that are to be found here. It is the Church catholic, or universal (not Papal), as composed of these parts, which we think proper to recognise, for the sake of argument, as corresponding with the popular meaning attached

to this term, when used in a catholic sense. In a narrower sense, every sectarian means by this term, while addressing those who are likely to understand his allusions, the particular Christian fraternity to which he belongs; but, in this place, we mean the Church catholic. Christianity has been so long in the world,—has asserted and realized such claims to public attention,—has been so widely known, so thoroughly discussed, so extensively influential,—has been embraced and opposed by so many individuals and nations,—has, in all ages, enlisted so much talent to expound, defend, or overthrow it,—has been loved so enthusiastically and hated so cordially,—and has so distinctly defined the character of its disciples from the rest of mankind, that all minds of common information, in the communities where it has obtained a footing, are as familiar with the terms "church" and "world," as with heaven and earth, fire and water, man and beast, or any other couple of names that can be selected; and the common idea of the distinction between the two is scarcely less definite and well understood. There may be many things comprehended in the term "church," when viewed in all its relations and suggestions, which are not commonly thought of; and Christians themselves, in the light of their sectarian peculiarities, are accustomed to define it variously; but the common and popular meaning is nearly uniform.

We are prepared, then, to say, *that the Church of Christ, as a society, in its own proper organi*

zation, is the only and the very society, under the commission given by Jesus Christ, which he has authorized to be employed by his professed disciples for the reformation of morals and manners in the world, and for the gradual and ultimate subjection of all mankind to the laws and principles of the Bible. This alone is sufficient—is best; and any other social organization of Christians, for purely Christian purposes, is a subtraction from the moral power of this;—is a neglect or perversion of the great and only commission;—is an impeachment of the wisdom of the Divine mind, as not having suggested or furnished an adequate law of association;—and has ever been, and, as we believe, will ever be, injurious. It is by a departure from, and a violation of this rule, in the erection of the Church of Rome into a stupendous political organization, that it has brought such a train and world of evil upon mankind; it was by the violation of this principle that the first Jesuitical school, organized by the genius of Ignatius Loyola, obtained such a wide-spread and disastrous sway over so many nations and tribes; and it is, in our opinion, by the same mistake—vice, we may call it—that Christians of our own day are disregarding the law of Christ, and running into multiform associations of a purely extemporaneous character, detracting from and annihilating the appropriate influence of the Church, and intrusting powers in the hands of small associations of individuals, which, till human nature shall be greatly improved,

cannot fail to tempt them to tread in the footsteps of the Jesuitical school, as far as they can conveniently go without being the objects of suspicion. Here, in our view, is the secret of that insinuating power which, for somewhat less than a generation past, has been stealing its march over the wide community of our country in these organizations; and which at this moment is so all-pervading and so formidable, that nothing, apparently, but some special interference of Providence, can arrest its overwhelming career. It has literally bound the public mind of this country in chains; and there are few that will dare to think for themselves, or to speak what they think. Societies of various names have been formed, all upon the same principle, professedly designed for moral and religious reformation, which have absorbed the most substantial and influential portions of the community, secured to themselves an unrivalled influence and a thorough internal independence, so that they are able now to bid defiance to any opposition. Their agents swarm over the land in clouds, like the locusts of Egypt: there is not a city, or town, or village, or settlement, from Georgia to Maine, from the Atlantic coast to the Rocky Mountains, which has not its minor and subsidiary association, and in many of them they are multiplied—all pouring in their contributions to the central treasuries, resigning the entire control of the affairs of these institutions, and the disposal of their funds, to a few individuals at their head, who are them-

selves, in the first place, and by their own enactments, well and independently endowed. The press, with all its various powers, is ever active in the circulation of just such information as may suit the designs of those who govern all. Truth is suppressed, and falsehood imposed. The community, for the most part, are honest, confiding, and believe what they are told.

We do not say that all of these associations have been in the habit of deceiving the public to any considerable degree; but we have never known one in the history of which something of the kind could not be found. The excitements by which they have been raised into being, the highly-coloured and overstrained statements employed as arguments and appeals to the public, the promises of immediate and great results, and other artifices of the kind, have made it indispensable to follow them up with corresponding exaggerations, which often amount to a violation of truth. Exaggeration, in the nicety of morals, as we need not say, borders on immorality; and it would perhaps be useful, if this system must go on, that a society should be formed, to be called "The Society-Reforming Society," whose object shall be to correct the morals of these institutions.

But it will be said, "This field of reformation and of missionary enterprise, at home and abroad, has been before the Church, and why has she not occupied it? We have only assumed the work

which the Church refused to do." These men claim to be Christians who say this—are members of the Church, and under all the obligations of Christ's commands and commission. Are they aware that Christ has but one institution—one organized society on earth—and that is his Church? —that he has designed and commissioned this institution to take the lead in the renovation of the world?—that he has reserved the honours of these triumphs for this society alone?—that all the zeal and all the moral power that has been thrown into these other and new organizations, so far as it is pure and good, might and ought to have been invested in the Church under her own proper forms, to give vitality and energy to her operations?—and that this diversion is casting contempt on the Divine commission? Surely, if the Church has been delinquent, she needs the exciting influence of this spirit of enterprise; and just in proportion to the diversions of moral power thrown off in these other directions, will she decline and languish, and become inefficient. Every thing of good that can be effected by these organizations, could be done in the Church. It is deserting the ranks which Christ has called his people to fill; it is setting up other institutions opposed to his; it is employing means which Christ has never authorized; it is tasking human invention for novelties, in contempt of Divine appointments; it is introducing a system of man's device, to the prejudice and weakening of God's commissioned

agencies; it is tempting the servants of Christ by the allurements of power, and leading the hosts of God's elect into fields of political encounter, one against another, by creating a system of operations essentially political; and the end of the whole is, that it degenerates into Jesuitical manœuvring, and must necessarily bring a painful and calamitous catastrophe on the cause of Christianity. The Church may be more slow, but it is more sure. Slowness may be a virtue in comparison of such precipitate, forced, and violent movements. The Church has the confidence of the public; it is a known and responsible society; it is uniform and steady in its character; its principles are palpable and fixed; it cannot so easily be driven into rash deeds by a few restless and aspiring spirits; unhallowed ambition has comparatively little scope in her ranks, and is ever liable to check and control. But as to these other and irresponsible institutions, there is no knowing what they will come to; they have in them the elements of perpetual change and of usurpation; those who are fortunate enough to get the lead, may keep it, and do what they please, until, peradventure, they shall have got to the end of their race by some public exposure of their misdoings. All history shows that societies of this class are unsafe, at the head of which the first Jesuitical organization of the fifteenth century is a notable and admonitory example. We have no fear, indeed, that any of these societies will ever obtain a power equal to their great prototype; nor

do we believe they will ever presume upon like enormities. They must necessarily pay respect to the state of society, to the spirit of the age, and to the demands of public opinion. We are prepared to write our certificate to the actual, and, in some instances, very extended usefulness of a portion of them. We would not give our vote for the dissolution of such, until the Church is prepared to assume their work, and carry it forward under her own Divine commission. Nevertheless, we have given our reasons for the anxieties we feel, as to the unavoidable tendencies of these institutions, some of which have already been made apparent in the history of their experiment; and we cannot dispossess ourselves of this conviction. The present is an age of reform, political, moral, and religious; and we desire to see the Church of Jesus Christ, in her own proper capacity, moving onward in the great work assigned to her.

But it will also be said, "The Church exists in several branches. Into which of these shall we throw our influence?" Into which you please. "But they cannot be all right, or equally right." No matter for that. The public pay respect to them; and so long as each has a standing with the public—with that portion of the public that is favourable to it—it may be useful in all these enterprises, and is competent to carry them forward by the aid of all who are disposed to fall into its ranks. Doubtless one branch of the Church is more right

than another in its structure, economy of operations, &c.; though we cannot pretend to say that these branches will all finally fall into one. So long, however, as the Christian community is thus divided, each section may act in its own form in the great cause of reforming mankind and evangelizing the world; and we are not aware that any thing proper to be done in this work can be effected by these societies, which cannot be done by any and by each branch of the Christian community with equal efficiency, and consequently with greater security as to the final result. To assume that the Church cannot, or will not act, for these purposes, nor move forward in this cause, is a libel on the institution; and if there be truth in it, the sooner the Church is disbanded the better. By the existence of these other societies, so far as they absorb the influence and moral power of Christians, the Church is necessarily prevented from acting in this field as a Church. Her commission is usurped, and her duties transferred. If it be true that there is a spirit among Christians, who are members of the Church, to engage in these enterprises and carry them forward, it is proof that the same spirit, acting in the appropriate ranks of Christian influence, might accomplish the same objects; and even if they should be more tardy in the work, by being obliged first to rouse the Church, they would stand on legitimate and safe ground, and would be preparing the way for cer-

tain triumph, without disaster, or the hazard of defeat by adopting unwarrantable measures.

Again it may be said, "Some churches have no organization suited to these enterprises." It is time, then, that they had, if the enterprises are proper for Christians to be engaged in. We cannot conceive of any public enterprise incumbent on Christians, which every association, claiming to be a branch of the Church of Jesus Christ, ought not to be fully prepared to undertake, under its own proper organization. Surely, it cannot be supposed that Christ has given to his Church a defective commission? And if any body of Christians, calling themselves a Church, should find themselves deficient in this particular, it behooves them to inquire whether they are properly organized; whether they are upon the true foundation; whether, indeed, they are acting under the primitive and Divine commission.

CHAPTER VII.

Public Opinion favourable to Christianity.

It is proposed in this place to show, that we have arrived at a period in the history of Christianity, and to a state of society formed under its influence, when public opinion is favourable to its designs, and to those exemplifications of character which it enjoins. By public opinion is meant a state of general and predominant feeling on any subject of public and general interest. We suppose it true to say, that the stability and vigour of public opinion on any subject depend on the interest that has been felt in it; the length of time it has been agitated; the vicissitudes through which it has passed; and the difficulties it has had to encounter. Here, then, is a subject of immense and amazing interest, as has been, and is, universally conceded —of an interest which exceeds in importance all others that have ever been brought before the mind of man, whether it be regarded as relating to society or to individuals. And it has, generally, in all ages and countries, been felt to be so. Here is a subject, a religion, the claims and merits of which have been agitated and discussed for eighteen hundred years, not to say six thousand, by friends and foes, and by the mass of the greatest

talents known in the civilized world, for the time being—a subject which has secured the attention of the most obscure as well as the most exalted, and had a place in their opinions and affections, to approve or disapprove, to love or to hate. Here is a religion which is coeval with the race of man; and which has experienced all the vicissitudes that have befallen its disciples and adherents from Adam to Moses, from Moses to Christ, and from Christ to this hour. And here is a religion which has encountered difficulties in number not to be estimated, and in their formidable importance not to be weighed—difficulties from philosophy, from heretical invasions, from foes without and from foes within the pale of its professed adherents, and from the assailing and mighty arm of secular power, in ways and times untold. All the wisdom, and all the art, and all the power of man, with the powers of hell, have been arrayed against it; and in the progress of all these vicissitudes, and of all these hostile encounters, the opinion of the world concerning it has been silently and gradually forming and moulding, till it has attained its present shape and position. It may fairly be inferred, therefore, that this opinion has secured a stability, and grown to a vigour, which cannot be predicated of any other subject ever agitated by man, if such stability and vigour do, in fact, depend on the contingencies we have specified.

No other subject has ever addressed the mind of man with so much force, or with reason claimed

from it equal deference. That force has been felt, not indeed in proportion to the merits of the claim, but yet it has been felt. It was felt when Christianity was first proclaimed—felt thoroughly and deeply wherever the footsteps of the apostles were seen or their voice heard. "These men that have turned the world upside down have come hither also." All religions, however venerable by their antiquity, however deeply rooted in society and in the affections of their adherents by long culture and immemorial custom, however strongly maintained by the civil arm, yielded to its sway. The Roman empire, so vast in its extent, was shaken to its centre, and through all its departments, by the first onset. Some of the apostles and primitive evangelists made incursions into more distant regions with the same effect. Few and inconsiderable as they were, with little, scarcely any thing, of those means and pretensions which ordinarily give public men influence, they attracted the attention of mankind. As a necessary consequence, public opinion, to a wide extent, was brought into action on these new doctrines with amazing energy. It need not here be said that it was opposed to them—that those who first embraced Christianity did it under the reprobation of all common and prevailing opinions —and, to a very great extent, at the hazard of their lives. The hold which other religions had obtained on the public mind was too strong to be easily shaken—too deeply-seated to be soon eradicated. For ages their claims were supported by

the arm of secular power; and Christians, during the ten great persecutions of the Roman government, were hurried out of time into eternity, by thousands and tens of thousands, in every possible form of cruelty which human ingenuity could invent. At last Christianity triumphed, and was installed on the throne of the Cesars. It was the triumph of opinion—or the establishment and confirmation of a renovated public opinion in favour of this new religion. It had struggled long—conflicted "with principalities and powers, with the rulers of the darkness of this world," and literally waded through seas of blood. The conflict was mighty and long-protracted; it was with and against opinion—the opinion of the public, of the world, which was all the while undergoing a gradual modification.

Rome and its dependances were at the highest point of civilization; philosophy flourished; the arts were in great perfection; the mind of that period was in many respects enlarged, and destined to be influential on future ages. The advantages thus gained by Christianity over common opinion, were necessarily on such a basis, and so connected with future history, that they could not fail to be permanent in their influence. It is not easy for us to appreciate the importance of this groundwork, without a consideration of all those ways and modes by which the thoughts and opinions of such a period of the world are transmitted and become influential. The painful vicissitudes

and dark ages through which Christianity has since passed, have not materially affected or disturbed the advantages which it gained at this early period. In the final result, as it regards the basis of opinion on which Christianity now rests, those trying times may be shown to have been beneficial. Every age since the commencement of the Christian era, and all the changes through which the Church has passed, when rightly viewed and philosophically considered, have contributed to throw light on the Christian scheme, and to commend its theory and doctrines to the favourable opinion of mankind. The very corruptions and abuses of Christianity have operated in this way, because the good sense of mankind, when circumstances are favourable for its action, will always distinguish between such perversions and Christianity itself. This is the grand providential security, that no untoward events, and no corrupt opinions, however undesirable in themselves, and however disastrous in their temporary influence, can, in the end, injure Christianity. There is reason in man, and an approbation of truth, after all; and there is also in man an ability to discern the claims of truth.

It might seem, at first sight, and no doubt that opinion is commonly entertained, that Christianity has had its periods of retrocession in society. As regards its actual hold on the public mind, and its legitimate sway for the time being, this impression is correct; but, in connexion with ulterior in-

fluences, the aspects of the question are changed. All things considered, and taking into view the influence of previous on subsequent periods of human society, in connexion with all its accidental states, whether propitious or otherwise, Christianity has never, at any one time since its introduction, lost an inch of ground, but has been constantly on the gain; and, in our opinion, ever will be so. Individuals of human kind, and vast multitudes, even for ages, may lose by untoward events; but God and his cause cannot suffer. Society, as a whole, and in the long run, cannot suffer under that Divine economy which is now in progress. The first trials of the Church have been beneficial; the dark ages may be shown to have been beneficial; the arrogant assumptions, superstitious dogmas, and other abominations of the papal hierarchy, together with its extended and mighty sway, will yet prove beneficial; the infidelity which these corruptions of Christianity have begotten will yet have, and to no inconsiderable extent has already had, its uses —all contributing, directly and indirectly, to illustrate pure Christianity in its theory and legitimate operations. The common notion, sometimes expressed, that we are in danger of the recurrence of the same disasters, is unphilosophical. They can never recur, as the author is disposed to believe, in precisely the same form, on the same ground; and we have some reason to suppose, that all possible forms of evil, of which human society is capable, under the action of the Christian system, and in re-

lation to it, must be gone through, before that system in its purity can be thoroughly and universally established. This, as we need not say, is not owing to any defects of the system, but to the pravities of human nature in its abstract qualities, and as acted out in society. How far the world has advanced in this career may be matter of opinion, and we shall take the liberty, by-and-by, of declaring our own.

As a reasonable theory, founded on history and the doctrines of the Bible, the author is inclined to suppose, in accordance with the above sentiments, that the corrective influence of Christianity is not designed to be forcible, but natural; that human nature is left to act itself out thoroughly, in all possible forms, under the operation of this system; that every stage is an advancement towards the termination of the grand experiment, which will certainly be triumphant; and that a retrograde movement, or even a hinderance, is not to be expected. We see no evidence that such an event has ever occurred, all things considered.

As an extension of the above theory, the author has felt warranted, from observations of history, and from views suggested by the actual operations of society throughout the range of the Christian era, in relation to Christianity, to suppose, that the grosser forms of evil inflicted by man on this system, to embarrass, impede, and arrest it, and to injure its disciples and advocates, are for the most part to be found in the earlier history of Christianity; that

upon the same premises, or in the same communities, they gradually subside into milder and more subtle forms, till they approximate to such semblances of Christianity as to be with difficulty distinguished; and that the last evils with which Christianity will have to contend—and which we are disposed to believe mark the character of the present age—will not come from without, but from within her own pale. Of course, this theory cannot be appreciated without a consideration of the apparent exceptions to the rule, resulting from accidents which, rightly understood, are perfectly consistent with the theory itself. For example—when Christianity is first introduced on new ground, it need not be surprising if it should have to pass through the severe ordeal of the grosser forms of hostility, although, by favourable circumstances and occurrences arranged by Providence, it may escape them—especially in the present age, when Christian civilization can often wield such unexampled facilities in its descent on pagan territories, to secure an overwhelming influence in the outset. This influence is more easily acquired over barbarous and feeble tribes, than over semi-barbarous and powerful nations; and more easily over the latter than over higher degrees of civilization. China, for example, will not unlikely present formidable obstacles to the introduction and establishment of Christianity; or, if jealousy should not at first be awakened, Christianity, after having been fairly introduced, may have to encounter appalling diffi-

culties. As a general truth, we observe, in the whole history of Christianity, that its earlier difficulties arise from the grosser forms of evil, which man singly or in society can inflict. There have been and will be rare exceptions, which may easily be accounted for without impairing our respect for this theory. It may also happen that some of the more subtle forms shall be contemporaneous with the grosser, such as false philosophy and heresy—which accords with history.

It is, however, accordant with fact in the history of Christianity, that violent measures of hostility have gradually subsided with the growing influence of its principles. But the forms in which Christianity may be opposed or checked are greatly diversified, from the more palpable and most severe applications of the secular arm, to the influence of a political legislation of a less severe character, but yet bearing indirectly and powerfully on the object of its hostility; from secular control to the spiritual tyranny of ecclesiastical councils, and to their severe though subtle discipline, as in the history of the Inquisition, and other devices of the kind, from the latter power in its grosser applications to its milder forms of control; from ecclesiastical domination to the various denominations of heresy and unsound philosophy; from secret foes within to open foes without, as in the assaults of infidelity in its various modes; from the grosser forms of fanaticism to those more refined; from heresies in doctrine to vicious standards of Chris-

tian character; from one species of sectarism to another; until finally all kinds and modes of evil, bearing on Christianity and relating to it, which the mind of man can invent or society organize, shall have been exhausted.

In the progress of these changes, we conceive it natural and accordant with fact, that the common opinion of the world on a catholic Christianity should be constantly improving and approximating to the standard of truth, and that this opinion is worthy of great respect. The opinion of which we now speak is of a subtle, but yet of an interesting and most influential character; it pervades all ranks and classes of the community; it is in the conscience of the wicked as well as of the good; it is an effect which the will of man cannot control, even though he be vicious; it insinuates its progress over the mind of the community; it has been in a course of formation ever since Christianity was set up; all revolutions and changes of society within the pale of Christendom, and all changes of opinion relating to Christianity, in whole and in particular, have only contributed to mature and establish this state of the public mind. It can no more be shaken or disturbed, than the common opinion of society on the plainest and universally recognised principles of morals; as that theft is a vice, and a conscientious respect for the rights of others a virtue.

"If there be any thing with which men have to do, and which has to do with men, and yet too

ghostly, too impalpable, to be made a subject of definition—it is what is commonly called *public opinion*. Though we are embarrassed in defining it, no one doubts its existence; though it does not present itself in palpable forms, all men feel it. Its secret and invisible influence operates on every mind, and modifies every one's conduct. It has ubiquity, and a species of omniscience; and there is no power on earth so stern in its character, so steady in its movements, so irresistible in its sway. Every other power must in these days do homage at its altar, and ask leave to be. The thrones of kings stand by its permission, and fall at its nod. It is a power that lives while men die, and builds and fortifies its intrenchments on the graves of the generations of this world. With every substantial improvement of society, itself improves; with every advancement, it plants its own station there, and builds upon it, but never yields. Time and the revolutions of this world are alike and equally its auxiliaries, and contribute by their influence to its maturity and increasing vigour."

Such particularly is the character and growth of public opinion in regard to such a system of morals and religion as Christianity, because, in the first place, it is a system of truth; and next, because truth, perpetually and long agitated, gradually settles down and finds a permanent basis in the public mind. It is this power of general opinion, which in theory "has adopted Christianity" as the subject of its approval, "and set itself up its advo-

cate and defender in the hands of an Almighty Providence." It is itself God's hand, peculiarly and emphatically, inasmuch as it is not left to the will of individuals to disturb it, however they might be inclined. It is that social influence which is peculiarly in God's own keeping; by which he governs the world; and by which he will at last bring the world in subjection to the sceptre of his Son. We say only, that opinion is the mediate connexion with such an end; and that opinion may be sound and favourable, while the heart refuses compliance with the precepts of Christianity. The convictions and conscience of the great community, in all that respects the theory of Christianity, may be right, while the hearts of individuals rebel against these convictions.

"In the days of the apostles and in many subsequent ages, public opinion stood marshalled against Christianity. It was not till after the political and moral convulsions of nearly eighteen centuries—convulsions, in the midst of which Christianity was preparing its ground and planting its seeds; it was not till spiritual Babylon had thoroughly disgusted and astounded the world with its arrogance and abominations; it was not till the sun of the reformation, rolling on to the West, had gone down in that region where first he rose, and opened again his morning twilight in Luther's grave; it was not till infidelity had done its worst, and 'played such tricks before high heaven as made the angels weep;' it was not till Mohammedism and Paganism

had wearied out the patience and drunk the very life-blood of the most endearing hope of man; it was not till man had tried every expedient to work out his own salvation but the only true one; it was not till every human and diabolical invention to undermine the foundations and defeat the designs of Christianity had been exhausted; in a word, it was not till all these great events, and all that is comprehended in them, had transpired in the providence of God, that Christianity seems to have gained a footing and an influence in the respect and over the affections of mankind, which cannot easily be shaken";—nay, which, we believe, can never be shaken.

We suppose it will not be questioned, that Christian nations are at the summit tide of influence over human affairs; that paganism must melt away before Christianity as snow and ice before the approach of a torrid sun, when once the splendour of its rays shall be brought to bear upon it by the combined enterprise of Christian communities; and consequently, if Christianity may now be regarded as securely established in the good opinion and respect of Christendom, it is determined for the whole world. Those nations that have long enjoyed Christianity have found that they cannot do without it. France tried, and what was the result? Christianity pervades all the moral elements of society throughout Christendom, confirms the civil, and hallows the social relations, and forces politicians and statesmen to feel their dependance on its sanctions and general

influence for the security and well-being of states and nations. The insolent pretensions and imprudent scoffs of infidelity, and the mad ravings of licentiousness, can never again, as we think, acquire ascendency, except in the transient triumphs of a mob; while the steady march of the more stable institutions of society is onward, settling deeper and firmer on the foundations of Christian principle. The time has come when any truly catholic Christian enterprise may find a patronage and support in all Christian nations, and among all Christian sects. All the more hallowed affections of man, in the social state, hover round and light upon the altars of Christianity as a common sanctuary. Men have learned to distinguish between the abuses of religion and its legitimate designs; and their respect for Christianity is not diminishing, but increasing; it may, we think, be regarded as fixed and settled on an immoveable basis—the basis of a common and favourable opinion.

Take, for example, the common opinion entertained in Great Britain towards Christianity, its institutions, and its theory. The abuses of religion have been great there, and are still great—especially in the operation of the Church Establishment—enough, one would think, to destroy all respect for religion; nevertheless, the common opinion in relation to Christianity is sound and healthful. The people distinguish between these abuses and Christianity itself, and attach the responsibility of the former where it belongs.

Take the common opinion entertained in our own country on the same subject. There are many abuses of religion here—abuses great and flagrant —nevertheless, the people, as a body, respect Christianity. The theory of Christianity is generally understood and appreciated, both as respects its theology and its morals. So enlightened is the public mind on this great subject, we consider it true to say, that the common notions of Christian theology, of Christian morals, and of Christian character, as entertained by well-informed persons *out* of the pale of professing Christians, are generally worthy of more respect than those entertained *within* that pale, as this line is commonly drawn; and for this reason, that the religious opinions held *within* it are more or less corrupted by the extravagances of sectarism. Religious extravagances and sectarian peculiarities, when embraced, whether they relate to doctrine or practice, are always made more prominent and held more tenaciously than the sobrieties of more essential truth; and consequently mar the symmetry and beauty of the proper exemplifications of Christianity. But on this point more hereafter. We only desire in this place to suggest, what we conceive to be true, that Christianity, as a system of theology and morals, has a fixed and stable footing in the public mind of this country—a footing which cannot be shaken. It is God's own creation, thus far matured by the events and changes of eighteen centuries. On that account it is worthy of the

greatest respect, and of more respect than the accidental peculiarities of sectarian belief.

Take, indeed, the common opinion prevalent over the Christian world on the merits and claims of the Christian system—setting aside that disrespect which has been occasioned by the abuses of religion, and which, being controlled by feeling or passion, is rendered incompetent to judge in the case—and the verdict will be uniform, with scarcely a feature of diversity. For a catholic Christianity there is but one opinion over this wide field, among all minds of competent information, and which have escaped the bias of accidental circumstances unfavourable to the formation of a correct judgment. This hypothetical case, we maintain, is a fair standard; and we believe it is true, that opinion thus formed controls society against the influence of other opinions, that may exist for the time being, even though they may be extensively prevalent. The reigning public opinion of France at this moment—which is probably the strongest case that could be brought against our present position—is in favour of Christianity. That is, however extensively the leaven of infidelity may be there diffused, even though it be admitted to pervade the minds of nine tenths of the population, yet the community, as a whole, could not be brought to declare publicly and solemnly against Christianity. Once, indeed, such an opinion was expressed and recorded by their national authorities; and the conscience of the nation will

for ever blush at the deed. Now, derelict as they are in many and in nearly all points of Christian character, as compared with other Christian nations, they would be horror-struck if they believed themselves capable of re-enacting that scene. They even decree the support of Christianity from the national treasury. All we propose to show, by a reference to this fact and to this state of society, is, that it determines undeniably the state of public opinion towards Christianity,—that the reigning conscience of the community is in favour of it. It shows, moreover, from the known character of the French people, that public opinion is not a sure and exact exponent of the amount of public virtue on the subject in question. Nevertheless, the prevalent opinion is no less certainly determined, nor is it any less fixed, unchangeable, and controlling, in its influence and bearings on general society. The theory of Christianity is understood; its doctrines, fairly interpreted, are allowed to be excellent; and its own proper exemplifications are universally approved—even in France.

The public opinion of a community of rogues, respecting the virtues essential to the social state, may be right, while every member is plotting mischief against every other member, inasmuch as he knows that the abstinence from vice of those around him constitutes his own facility for preying upon their interests. In the same manner a public opinion may be formed in favour of Christianity, before the community where it prevails have become decidedly Christian.

Take Germany, where, it is said, the dominant philosophy is—a very charitable theory indeed—that all religions are good, but that Christianity is the best. Even there, and on this supposition, public opinion is in favour of Christianity. So is it everywhere throughout the nominally Christian world. There is no exception, even in the midst of the most flagrant and worst corruptions of Christianity. No Christian community, commonly ranked as such, could be induced to declare against it, either as respects the theology which it teaches, the morality which it inculcates, or the practices which it enjoins, in distinction from other religions, or no religion at all; but the voice of all united is in its favour, in each of these particulars, and on catholic grounds: and we think it fair and philosophical to infer—and that no other philosophy could account for such a state of things—that this prevailing opinion is the product of the various action and influences of Christianity on human society during the term of its history. We can see satisfactory reasons for believing that this opinion cannot be shaken, nor even disturbed; that it is destined to increase in stability and vigour; and that eventually it must overcome all obstacles in the way of that thorough renovation of society which the Christian system professedly contemplates.

It becomes, then, a practical, as well as a curious and interesting inquiry, *whereabouts* we are in that

progress of opinion which, if our reasoning is just, is destined instrumentally to secure the ultimate and complete triumphs of Christianity. Obviously this opinion has unequal degrees of influence in different countries, and under divers forms of Christianity; and may, therefore, fairly be supposed to have attained unequal degrees of maturity in these different conditions. Our first object has been to show, that it is everywhere, throughout Christendom, on the whole and decidedly favourable to Christianity. This is a very important and most satisfactory conclusion. It evinces that we have arrived at a period when Christianity has attained a high and controlling vantage-ground over all opinions that have been or are now opposed to it.

It may be remarked, however, and we think with justice, that this advantage is far greater in Protestant countries than in Papal. The greatest shock which human society has ever experienced was in that fearful revulsion of opinion, relating to Christianity, commonly called "French infidelity," and which has since overrun the Christian world under various modifications and with different degrees of power. This was the natural offspring of Papal usurpations and malepractices, and has been nourished by faults to be found even in the Protestant religious world. Instead of pronouncing hastily against this system of infidelity, as if there were no grounds, no apology for it, as has often and magisterially been done, there are some claims

even for our respect in those states of mind and in that determination of character which resolved to be free from the intolerable bondage of a religion so corrupt. The passions which drove men into such a fearful extreme, were generated, not by the action of Christianity, direct or indirect, but by a false religion, by hypocritical pretensions, and by a spiritual despotism unrivalled. These enormities were seen and appreciated by minds of a superior order; and, hastily identifying Christianity with these corruptions, the resolution was taken to crush the entire fabric, and "down with the Galilean." The error was a want of discrimination; but the grounds of complaint and hostility were real and just. In so far as the effort was turned against Christianity, it must ever be a subject of regret; but, as it rose in arms against a corrupt religion, it was well provoked.

That great and bold attempt, as we conceive, has exhausted its principal and vital energies, as a plan to overthrow Christianity; and nothing now remains of that combined and well-ordered host, but a few scattered and undisciplined straggling outlaws, maintaining a guerilla and predatory warfare, as they occasionally sally out from their fastnesses and dens on the fair fields of Christian cultivation. And we shall yet have reason to see, that, as a corrupt religion was the parent of that notable school of infidelity, so the faults of religionists of these days are the principal, if not the only, occasion of the infidelity that yet remains—

an infidelity, not of principle, but of sentiment—of mere prejudice.

Even in the Papal countries of Europe, the infidelity which broke out in France a half century ago has completely failed of its design, notwithstanding the aliment of religious extravagances and enormities, which is there so abundantly to be found to nourish and sustain it. We do not say that the leaven of this infidelity is not widely diffused in those regions,—that it does not operate with considerable energy,—that it does not menace society with convulsions, like those which revolutionized France. So long as these corruptions of Christianity exist, this antagonist element, which they beget and provoke to action, must also exist. They will live and expire together. The former reproduces the latter, as certainly as that the human race is perpetuated by natural generation. All we mean to say is, that the design of overthrowing Christianity has failed, and failed decisively, and for ever;—that the force of this great attempt is spent, even in the bosoms of Papal communities.

How much more in Protestant countries? For a time there was very great alarm, both in Great Britain and America, lest infidelity should seriously injure Christianity; and that alarm has scarcely subsided at this moment. Indeed, we know that the apprehension is still extensively prevalent, in minds as distinguished for their discernment into the workings of society as for their moral worth, that there will yet be another irruption of infidelity,

of a very grave character, and in a desolating career. But, for ourselves, we see so many reasons for respecting the theory propounded in these pages, —viz., that the capital forms of evil which Christianity has to encounter are rarely, if ever, renewed under precisely the same type on the same premises,—that we cannot sympathize with this apprehension. Neither is the author aware that he has any special love for this theory, as having originated it, if indeed it be a fact. The theory, if he mistakes not, has grown out of a sober examination and consideration of history, and is based upon it. He believes, philosophically, that the human mind, as developed in the shape of public opinion, cannot be brought back to the position of doubting the superior and divine claims of Christianity, if indeed it has ever doubted, since the Christian system came into general credit. That there have been strong tendencies to such a skepticism, over a wide range of the nominally Christian world, and among powerful and philosophical minds, is commonly supposed to be a veritable feature of history; nay, that skepticism has raged, and seemed to triumph: but still it may be questioned whether it has at any time very seriously disturbed that all-ruling element which we denominate public opinion, when rightly understood—except within very narrow limits; and even then, as we think, the disturbance may be shown to have been the result of political rather than of infidel principles.

We cannot resist the obvious fact, that the transient prevalence of infidelity, in connexion with its defeat on all points which have been in debate, has resulted in the more complete establishment and stable confirmation of Christianity in the general esteem of Christian communities, so as apparently to bid defiance to any future disturbance from the same cause. All the leading and ruling spirits of Christian nations have evidently abandoned the idea, if it was ever entertained, that society can do without Christianity; and we confess, we have no philosophy by which we can comprehend how they are likely to be driven from such a position, which has been taken and occupied from principle—from conviction, after the merits of the great question between Christianity and infidelity have been so thoroughly discussed before their eyes. On the contrary, the symptoms are obvious, that respect for Christianity is on the increase among the higher walks of mind, as well as in the lower; and the reasons which have produced this state of things must inevitably, as we think, continue to operate in the same direction.

Not to speak of the Protestant communities of continental Europe, Great Britain and the United States seem to be much in advance of the rest of the world in the respect entertained by the public mind for Christianity and its institutions. Within these limits that respect is decisive, it is great, it is very influential. Moreover, we think it is manifestly increasing. In the United States particularly,

it has become a vital and powerful element; and in Great Britain it seems to be marching forward in the same career of a growing influence. In the ranks of well-bred society, in either of these countries, the obtrusion of infidel principles would be as much out of good taste, and as offensive, as vulgar profanity; it would be absolutely shocking. What does this prove, but a high, a pure, a chastened state of the public mind—a conventional standard of taste touching this great subject, constructed on Christian principles? A public conscience of this nice and scrupulous character, which everybody is careful to protect, and not to offend, when philospohically viewed, determines more than what is commonly imagined in favour of the position which our argument occupies—determines, indeed, what probably is rarely thought of. How comes it? Whence this mysterious and all-pervading sympathy, which, in respectable company, and so long as a pride of character and desire of public esteem remain, binds the tongue of the profane in silence, and hushes the murmurs of unbelief?—or which, if violated, is suffused with the blush of mortification? It demonstrates, if there be such a thing as demonstration in the classes of evidence, that Christianity is enthroned in the public conscience. No other facts of an opposite character, however numerous, and wherever culled, would, in the least degree, diminish the force of this single argument, or disturb the conclusion to which it conducts us. For here, after all, is this

nice moral sense pervading all the respectable and most influential circles of the community—a feeling which is the growth of time—of many centuries—and which, even within an age, has attained to a purity and vigour far beyond any former period. It presents itself everywhere, like the guardian angel of this sacred trust—a trust brought down from heaven and confided to men in their social condition—to see that its beauty be not marred, and that the sanctuary of its rights be not invaded —to rebuke offenders, and to encourage and sustain the good. The mystery of this influence, if mystery there be in it, does not detract from the obviousness of the great fact. It needs but to be named, to be seen and felt. We all know that the world around us, and, so far as we may have had opportunities to be acquainted with it, at home or abroad, on the land or on the sea, in America or in Europe, when its attention is challenged by the ordinances and claims of Christianity, bows in reverence at the name of Jesus; and that all the considerations suggested by his character, his mission, and office, are generally held in respect and viewed as sacred. Even corrupt minds, and minds of the basest character, are, in spite of themselves, powerfully influenced by this state of society. How much more the pure and virtuous? It is an influence which insinuates its progress, steals silently over the public mind, and holds conscience everywhere in abeyance.

CHAPTER VIII.

Public opinion favourable to the proper exemplifications of Christian character.

It becomes necessary for our present purpose to make a distinction, which is as obvious as it is philosophical, between religion and Christianity. Christianity is a religion, but it is only one of a thousand—or of an indefinite number. And not only are there myriads of religionists in the world who are not Christians, but there are religionists under the Christian name, who, though not equally far from being Christians, are yet so far as not to be so. And there is a vast deal of the religion of Christians themselves which is not Christianity. A Christian may be very religious without adding to the improvement of his character; nay, he may be so to its positive detriment; because his religion, that is, the remarkable or uncommon degrees of it, may be of a stamp which Christianity does not warrant—which it was never intended to produce. For example—the acerbities, austerities, mortifications, self-tortures, long and severe fastings, and many other excesses, that have been reckoned of so much account among Papists, and for which multitudes of their devotees have been canonized—are being very religious. But this is not Christianity. The prescribed penances, Ave

Marias, and other excessive devotions of Papists—are being very religious. But it is not true religion. "Is it such a fast that I have chosen?—a day for a man to afflict (torture) his soul? Is it to bow down his head as a bulrush, and to spread sackcloth and ashes under him? Wilt thou call this a fast, and an acceptable day to the Lord?"

Mohammedans are very religious; and none more than, or so much so, as some of the heathen. They will crawl on the ground for hundreds of miles, lie for weeks and months on beds of spikes, swing suspended in the air on hooks thrust under the muscles of their bodies, fall down and be crushed under the car of Juggernaut;—and this is being very religious. There are no propensities in man so extravagant and absurd, none so powerful and cruel, as the religious, when religion has taken a strong hold of the affections and passions, without a corresponding light—the light of truth, shed into the mind. The moment a man becomes religious, if the change be sudden, that moment he inclines to excess—to superstition. And not only so, but the earnest culture of the religious affections, in company with an ardent and prolific imagination, while the understanding is neglected and the light of truth shut out, is in danger of leading to extravagance; and this is being very religious. But it is not Christianity.

There is a natural and popular taste for religious excesses; and those religious biographies which are most extravagant, and which can never be

generally imitated—and the imitation of which is by no means desirable—are most eagerly sought and devoured—for the same reason that young people are interested in the exciting pages of a novel. The sober, yet fervent piety, and uniform life of Jesus Christ, have no interest in them compared with such accounts. The life of Christ is not sufficiently exciting. Moreover, although we are certified, by the pen of inspiration, that a complete history of the incidents of the Saviour's life would have more than filled the world with the number of its volumes; and although it must be conceded that a detailed account of his acts, habits, and sayings, from the beginning to the end of his days, would have been unspeakably interesting, yet is it remarkable that infinite wisdom thought proper to suppress so much and give us so little. Is there no inference from this? Is it not a rebuke to that passion for filling the world with the most extravagant things of the most extravagant religionists? We confess, we have often felt that the very things which are most interesting and most approved, in the published and most popular lives of the most religious men—and which are set forth as a pattern—are the things which ought not to be told. It proves, indeed, that they were very religious—but it is the religion of romance. We might give names of this class, which are cherished among Protestants as much as the canonized saints among the Papists; and for the same reason, that their history is romantic. They are virtually canonized,

And who can tell how many of them have lived and died in anticipation of this celebrity? The motive is natural and credible.

If the argument of the preceding chapter be sound, viz., that public opinion is in favour of Christianity, as a religious theory, or the theory of a religion, we think it follows, that it must be in favour of the proper exemplifications of Christian character.

In the way of a disclaimer to a certain unwarrantable conclusion, which may be forcibly attached to this position by some theologians and religionists, as a convenient panoply for their own dogmas, it is due to the writer to say, that he means nothing, by what is here asserted, which shall even seem to be at variance with the commonly received item of Christian theology—that the heart of man is evil and corrupt. This position does not involve that question, nor approach it; but simply goes to determine a matter of history, whether the common opinion of the age approves of the Christian system in theory, and of Christian character as an exemplification of that theory. It does not determine whether those who entertain this opinion are virtuous or vicious in the Christian sense of these terms, or in any other sense. It only decides that they believe what they cannot help believing, and feel what they cannot help feeling, viz., that Christianity and Christian character are worthy of their respect. It does not determine that they are not

in heart opposed to both, and that they do not hate true religion, and all who love it. But it only professes to settle the question, whether the present state of society holds the vicious in restraint, and compels their conscience to honour true religion; and whether the most influential portions of the community pay a deference to Christianity and its true disciples, that is favourable to them? And this, the author humbly thinks, is decidedly the case. He is prepared to affirm to these questions.

It was true in the times of Paul, that "if any man should live godly in Christ Jesus, he would suffer persecution." But this is not of course always true. It was true in the time of Christ, and, for aught we can see, seems little less true now, that "few find the strait gate," and that "many go in the broad way;" but this will not be true in the Millennium. "Ye can discern the face of the sky, but can ye not discern the signs of the times?" Times have changed, and are constantly changing; and we have not only a Divine warrant, but a Divine admonition, to observe these changes.

It is doubtless true, that the character of the times in which we live, in respect to the point now under consideration, is not commonly discerned and appreciated, especially by the great majority of theologians and professing Christians, if there be any good reasons for the position which the author has presumed to take. We have been accustomed to hear from the pulpit, from time immemorial, and to be taught in numberless forms of

religious literature, that the irreligious world, meaning non-professors of religion, and assuming that they have no title to the Christian name, are opposed to religion and to Divine truth; and that, if Jesus Christ were now on the earth, he would meet with as much opposition, and be treated as violently by the present generation of men in Christian lands, as was the case at the time of his earthly residence among the Jews. It is not uncommon to hear it averred, that he would be as likely to be crucified.

The author admits and believes, that the human heart is the same in its native qualities; and that nothing but the grace of Christianity is competent to renovate and prepare it cordially to embrace the truths of the Bible in all their peculiarities. But, for the reasons advanced in the previous chapter, he cannot believe that the state of society is the same. On the contrary, and for the same reasons, he believes that society has been undergoing gradual modifications ever since Christianity was introduced, by its ameliorating influence, till, in Christian lands, and especially in Protestant countries—more particularly in Great Britain and the United States—it has providentially attained to the condition when, as a mass, the religious and irreligious, Christians and infidels, have a common and very tolerably correct knowledge of Christianity and of its peculiar doctrines, and have learned how to appreciate Christian character; that society, as a whole, comprehending all classes, has agreed

to a standard of character, with the Bible as a rule, which is in the main correct and scriptural; that this standard has received a universal approbation; that it commends itself to the consciences of the most wicked and abandoned; that society generally, instead of finding fault with professing Christians for aiming at this standard, and coming up to it in all that they can, will only find fault when they come short of it; that common opinion approves of these aims and of these high attainments; that the more perfect Christians are, the more are they esteemed; that no matter how pure, no matter how active and zealous, no matter how influential, in the exhibitions of their own proper character, the world exclaims—"This is as it should be;" and that, if Jesus Christ were now living among us, his conduct, his doctrines, and his manners, would be generally, if not universally, approved.

The author therefore conceives, that that doctrine is extravagant which leads its advocates to the conclusion, that all who are not Christians in heart will always and invariably oppose Christianity; that they cannot appreciate the worth of Christian character and approve it; and that no circumstances, or state of society, can so modify their views as to reconcile them, even in theory, to the grand purpose and aims of the Christian scheme, when rightly understood. The doctrine is contrary to fact, else a vast number must be acknowledged as Christians who are now, without

hesitation, excluded from the pale, and who do not themselves think of laying claim to this character. They who have been accustomed to maintain this doctrine are at liberty to elect their own alternative, viz., to baptize these reputed unbelievers, or abandon their theory. If they choose the former, the visible Church will soon be greatly enlarged; if the latter, their own character, we think, will be greatly improved in one particular. We would recommend a little of both.

The author is aware that certain theological notions, extensively prevalent, and long maintained, will probably be in the way of the discernment and admission of that state of society here declared as characteristic of the age—not because facts are at war with their theory, properly expounded, but because the advocates of the theory, in their zeal to defend it, have forced it into a bold and somewhat extravagant position, and are naturally jealous of being disturbed. It is remarkable that the philosophy of theology is, to a wide extent, behind every other species of philosophy; and in many minds, professing to have theology in trust, asserts for itself peculiar and exclusive prerogatives. Long-cherished theological theories, intrenched behind the high and massive walls of elaborated tomes of reputed orthodoxy, are always afraid of invasion from the camps of the profane. When the true astronomical theory was first propounded, it was authoritatively pronounced a heresy, and its advo-

cates treated accordingly. We need not say it has since been shown that the alarm was groundless; and the theologians have been publicly convicted of ignorance and folly. The late observations and discoveries in the geological structure of the earth, startled again the entire ranks of those who had embraced and long cherished the theory, dear in their religious belief, that the earth, the solar system, and the universe, were made only for the race of men; that the system dates its existence some six thousand years ago, and is destined to be used as fuel for the fire that shall consume the wicked. But since Baron Cuvier did not live long enough to fulfil his engagement to show, before the Paris Bible Society, that geological philosophy is not at war with the Mosaic history, Professor Silliman and others, in America and Europe, are well and successfully discharging the task of quieting the nerves of these alarmists. These and other facts of the same class, which abound in history, serve to show that theological philosophy, instead of wielding a leading and correcting influence, is itself, though slowly and reluctantly, led and corrected by other departments of philosophy. The philosophy of this philosophy lies, perhaps, in this: that theology is inclined to claim and assert peculiar prerogatives, by occupying ethereal positions aloof from the region of palpable facts, refusing to come down and dwell with men—and declining the judgment of men, till the fragments of its own exploded theories are scat-

tered, and fall harmless and unrespected on the ground, to be trampled under foot.

Theologians love system; and, when once their system is formed, they will allow nothing to invade it. Even facts are spurned, or tortured into coincidence with their views. Not so the Divine writings. "Truth, in the Scriptures, is always presented under some special aspect, or as seen from a particular position, or as bearing upon some definite human affection or immediate duty. It is not truth in the abstract. It is indeed a pure element; but it is a particle only of that element." "Not only do they (the Scriptures) abstain from conveying truth in universal and abstract terms, but they very rarely touch at all any theme that can be considered a proper object of scientific curiosity. This is now well understood, and therefore the attempt is no longer made to discover latent systems of physical science in the language of the Bible; and it is agreed on all hands, that, although Moses and the prophets contradict nothing which our modern science has demonstrated, it formed no part of their commission to imbed a scheme of the universe in the Hebrew text; and if physics and astronomy are not to be sought there, neither are metaphysics, nor psychology, nor pneumatology, to be inquired for from the inspired writers, notwithstanding that these subjects are much more nearly related to the principles of religion than the former can be."—"The inspired writers, when fairly interpreted, never give rise to

suppositions that are altogether unfounded, and *contrary to fact*."—"They always hold close to *mundane affairs*, and intend to speak only of the history and destiny of the families of the earth; seldom, if ever, opening to us a wider prospect."*

But speculating theologists often build parts of their systems in regions which the Bible has not opened, and upon grounds which it has not, by any fair interpretation, ever suggested. Hence they often come into collision with facts, and with discoveries of science. And such is their pertinacity, that they will not yield till they die off, and their speculations are forgotten—or remembered only as beacons of advice to fair and inquiring minds.

We have before us, at this moment, a world of facts, in the present state of society throughout Christendom, if the argument of this and the previous chapter be well founded, which, once admitted, will disturb some of the theological system-mongers, touching certain of their main points and intrenchments. "Nay," say they, "it cannot be so. Such a state of things is inconsistent with our speculations. Human nature is not good enough to be so favourable—so kind—to Christians and their objects." Nevertheless, such are the facts. Who can deny them? We could very easily quiet the apprehensions of these theologians under this surprising intelligence, if they would give us their ear long enough to be told, and manifest candour enough to appreciate the explanation

* Physical Theory of another life.

—that this state of society is not, in fact, at war with their speculations; that they may still hold human nature as depraved as they please, even in its natural instincts, if they like to have it so; that this state of opinion does not affect that question in one way or another. It is true, indeed, that a great work is saved at their hands; that the world is quite in advance of their belief—better informed than they had imagined; and, so far as they may be grieved at this discovery, we have little sympathy with them, and can offer no relief. It may also disappoint some of their schemes of reformation, by showing that they have come too late into the field, by having mistaken the age in which they live. All that, however, will be well both for them and for the public, as, being enlightened, and of course well disposed, it will give them an opportunity to fall into some of the more useful ranks of Christian enterprise.

The question suggested in the last chapter again returns:—*Whereabouts*, then, are we in this progress of opinion in favour of Christianity? and is it near to a final triumph?

It is well known that, within an age now past, there have been prevalent in the Christian world high and confident expectations that society is approaching and is near to its millennial period. Setting aside all extravagant interpretations of prophecy, and those high pretensions to prophetic discernment, with which our Christian literature so much abounded some twenty years ago, and

which, very naturally and properly, lost much of their credit when the expounders themselves set up to be prophets, the expectation is nevertheless worthy of great respect. There is very satisfactory evidence that a common and prevailing sentiment of the nature of expectation, relating to a coming event or change in society of great public importance, that has been begotten and widely cherished in the public mind by a consultation and deep study of the pages of revelation, and which has been gradually ripening and increasing in its influence, has not been without foundation. Such was the state of the public mind among the Jews when Christ appeared, and this notwithstanding society among them at that time was very corrupt. Their sacred records, too, were incomplete, and more dubious in their indications. But yet the event justified the expectation.

It will doubtless be admitted, that no age was ever so learned in the Scriptures as the present; and biblical learning has advanced with a rapidity unparalleled for a few years past, particularly in Great Britain and America. In some respects, it is known that the Germans led the way; but their interest in the results has been of a very different character. They have worked in this mine simply to expose its wealth and importance as a literary record; while Christians in England and in this country have used their acquisitions for practical purposes, in endeavouring to develop the future history, and to advance the interests of Christianity. At the same time that this study has chastened

expectation, and exploded the more common and prevalent theories founded on prophecy in their specific forms, some of which were very extravagant, we are not aware that it has essentially diminished the prevailing expectations respecting the Millennium. We believe, rather, that in enlightening the minds of the Christian public, it has strengthened and confirmed those expectations—especially in view of the extraordinary spirit of religious enterprise which characterizes the Christian community, and of the great facilities now afforded in multiform ways of promoting Christianity at home and spreading it abroad. There is less said concerning the Millennium, and more done to bring it about. The expectation is developed in the form of enterprise, rather than in sitting down to write or study commentaries on the prophecies. This expectation, however, manifestly prevails; and we have the more reason to respect it as it is manifested in this form. It is becoming practical and effective.

The argument we have undertaken to support in this and the previous chapter—viz., that public opinion is in favour of the designs of Christianity, and of those exemplifications of character which it enjoins—is in a high degree corroborative of this expectation. If the statements which have been made are warranted by the actual state of society, it would seem as if we must now be on the eve of passing to some higher and brighter stage of earthly existence.

CHAPTER IX.

The world more orthodox than the Church.

Or rather, the opinions prevalent in general society on Christian theology, Christian morals, and Christian character, are worthy of more respect than sectarian belief. Catholic Christianity, or that which is common to the great and leading Christian denominations, rejecting for the most part the peculiarities of sectarian creeds and practices, comprehends substantially the Christian system; and that is the more common belief of society—of all well-informed minds out of what is commonly regarded as the pale of the Church—of those who feel and profess a respect for Christianity. It is also the belief of the great mass of the community, so far as they have turned their attention to the subject. The author here has reference to that opinion existing so extensively in the world, having for its subject the Christian system in whole and in particular, as set forth in the two previous chapters, and which has been in the course of formation during the term of the Christian era. He conceives that this opinion has been under the special supervision and control of Divine Providence, and that it is nearer the truth than any thing else. All the parts of this opinion—for we use the

term comprehensively—may not be found in a single mind, but yet they may be gathered up from general society. There is not a doctrine of the Christian religion, nor a point of Christian morals, nor a feature of Christian character, nor any peculiarity of the system, which has not been considered and discussed over and over by the public, with little interruption, ever since Christianity was introduced—more especially in modern times. It is conceived, that every item of each of these classes of subjects, respecting which there has been a substantial agreement in all ages and with all minds, when it has been thoroughly and seriously considered, irrespective of sectarian or any other untoward influences, is worthy to be regarded as a part of the great system of truth. As that common and general opinion, which is favourable to Christianity as a whole, and which is the product of the action of the system on society for eighteen hundred years, in all its various forms, is the most correct of all opinions, and settled upon a basis which cannot be shaken; so we conceive, that every several item of that opinion, as it relates to specific doctrines and points of character, having had the same and such long-protracted opportunities of being correctly determined and settled, must also be worthy of a like respect. No peculiarities of sectarian belief, even when they do not come into collision with these, can lay claim to an equal regard; much less can they be brought into competition, as having a right to displace and annul

principles recognised and established by such a concurrence of disinterested authority.

It can hardly fail to be discovered, and must ordinarily be admitted, that every Christian sect has in some degree corrupted Christianity, either in its positive institutions, or in its doctrines, or in practice, or in all three—some by adding, some by subtracting, and some by addition and subtraction together. That which is common among them is more likely to be correct, and may doubtless be taken as the fairest representation of Christianity. This, we suppose, is the common opinion of the world, so far as they respect Christianity; and this is what is meant by the heading of this chapter—that the world is more orthodox than the Church—which is an undoubted truth in the sense here explained.

We come, then, to a point of no inconsiderable practical importance. It is to determine the comparative value of religious opinions *in* the Church and *out* of it. We use the term Church as comprehending the leading Christian sects, each of which claims to be at least a branch of the Church of Christ.

It is pretty well known, that the professed religionists of the Christian name—and some denominations more than others—are accustomed to regard themselves as intrusted with the sacraments, doctrines, and responsibilities of Christianity. To a great extent in our country, very little respect is rendered by professing Christians to the

religious opinions of those who have not attached themselves to a church. These latter are regarded by the former somewhat in the light of outlaws, as having no right in common with Christians, until they shall see fit to comply with certain regulations, which, perhaps, are not agreeable. No matter how well informed they may be on the subjects of Christian education; no matter how excellent and pure their lives; they must submit themselves to the prescribed conditions of entering a sectarian pale, before they can be recognised as Christians, or be admitted to the Christian sacraments, or have respect rendered to their religious opinions.

We do not suppose, indeed, that this self-complacent regard and attachment to sectarian peculiarities is equal with all classes of religionists. We know very well there are professing Christians—more, probably, in one connexion than in another, and some in all—who discard such feelings and are far above them. But yet, there has been so much overstraining of the importance of particular religious notions, as to bring the system of truth into distortion—into absolute caricature—so that the truths asserted and maintained become error, as they stand relatively to other truths before the mind of the public. The symmetry of the system is marred, destroyed, broken down—and, as a consequence, all unbiased minds, uncorrupted by the morbid feeling produced by these excesses, naturally and very properly demur to averments in these particular forms, and standing in such relations.

The things asserted may be true as they stand and are viewed in the minds of the assertors; but they are not true as they stand before the public. The picture in the minds of the advocates of these particular notions, although a distorted one, may yet, by dint of elaborate argument and superabundant explanation, be shown to have the lineaments of truth; but the moment the lecturer has stepped down from his rostrum, or the book is closed, the reasoning is forgotten, and common sense is still shocked by the naked assertions. This difference between the public and these high-wrought zealots grows into a controversy—the former remaining cool and temperate on the simple ground of dissent, or non-concurrence, as the case stands between the parties, while the latter get warm and wax warmer still, till they are thought to be unreasonable, and lose their influence. Hence it is most convenient and most comfortable for the sectarian to say—"We know, and you do not know; we are right, and you are wrong;" and there the matter stands—and there it will stand, so long as the bigot remains a bigot. The dissenter from these dogmas is charged with the crime of being a hater of the truth; a line of separation is drawn between what is affectedly called the church and the world; the former is the keeper and defender of the truth, the latter the aggressor; the church, so called, draws in and builds up its muniments of defence, becomes jealous of all around, and is constantly making war, and discharging its artil-

lery and smaller arms, while no enemy is at the gates.

Besides these caricatures of systematic theology, drawn by attaching undue importance to particular tenets, maintained with pertinacity, and making everlasting demonstration of a state of war, where no war is or need be, the rule of Jesus Christ for determining the character of his disciples, "by their fruits ye shall know them," has very extensively given place to the test of certain spasmodic convulsions of mind and of feeling. And the only qualification for admission to the privileges of a Christian standing, according to the theory of these religionists, is, that the candidates shall be able to show that they have passed through a specific course of "experience"—which may all be done in a day, in a night, or in an hour. No matter about the life; it is not now "by their fruits," but by the paroxysms of intellect and passion through which they have passed, that grace is made visible. If a candidate is able to answer a set catechism of speculative opinion satisfactorily, especially on the more extravagant and unintelligible points, and to give proof that he has been "exercised" in mind for a reasonable time, he may then be received into the Church. Far be it from us to speak disrespectfully of a religious concern of mind, under conviction of Divine truth; or of the results that flow from such conviction. The writer only has in view to express his opinion of that modern moral machinery, which has been put in

operation to turn out Christians in such quick and rapid succession, by a particular and uncertain test above referred to, so that no time is given for the proof of their character. We believe, conscientiously, that a false criterion, in the shape of a creed to determine religious belief, and in the shape of paroxysms of mind to determine Christian character, has become so extensively prevalent as terms of admission to certain Christian connexions, that the notions of the sober and serious part of the community without these pales on the points in question, and on religious subjects generally, are more correct, and worthy of more respect. The writer believes that religionists generally pay too little respect to the opinion of the world around them; that theologists are too magisterial; that creeds have too much sectarian point, and not a little of extravagance; and that all sectarian peculiarities are an impediment to the progress and a barrier to the triumphs of Christianity. "Save me from my friends, and I will take care of my enemies," is most truly applicable to the present position and relations of the Christian cause.

Who has not observed that society in this country contains multitudes in its bosom of most exemplary lives, and of a conscientious respect for Christianity, as commonly held; but who are kept back from appearing publicly as Christians on account of certain extravagant doctrines and prac-

tices in the religious world? In some places their influence in society is more important than that of all the church members, so called, put together. They support Christian institutions cheerfully; they attend on public worship, and bring their families; they have the education of Christians; they profess to believe what Christians commonly believe; they are conscientious; they have feelings in view of Divine truth which cannot be distinguished from those of Christians—and yet their opinions on religious subjects are not to be respected, because they cannot come up to certain sectarian demands!

CHAPTER X

Infidelity owing to the faults of religionists.

The subject here proposed, we think, will be found to be of practical and vital importance. Infidels are generally spoken of and treated, especially by the pulpit and the religious press, as if there were no reason in their cause—as if they were actuated by a pure hatred of Christianity, and nothing else. We propose to make their apology, and to treat them as fellow-beings worthy of our respect; not only as having minds constructed like the rest of their species, but as having reason for the use they make of such materials of argument as they have happened to be supplied with in the greatest excess—or in abundance. It will not be understood, however, that we offer an apology that will amount to a justification. Far from it. We only mean, that the faults of the religious world, and of religionists, have furnished, and still continue to furnish, aliment sufficient to account for all the infidelity that has existed.

It is now placed beyond a question, that the corruptions and abominations of the Papal Church were the specific, and, so far as can be seen, the sole occasion, of that notable and deep-laid scheme of infidelity, which was so fearfully developed in the

great French revolution of the last century. Wise, discerning, philosophic minds—minds of enlarged and high intellectual culture, gifted with native talents, and stored with treasures of learning, sufficient to command an unmeasured influence and sway—appeared upon the stage, in France and Europe, when the usurpations of papacy and the wiles of Jesuitism had attained their acme of power over the human mind, and over the institutions of society. Seeing nothing worthy of their respect in those professed representatives of the man of Galilee, or in their doings, but every thing to awaken disgust and rouse opposition, they formed their opinion of the merits and claims of Christianity, as was perfectly natural, and, for aught we know, in their circumstances, unavoidable, by the picture of the Church of Rome and its various abominations. The Jesuitical school was so perfect in its organization, and so widely influential, and the papal sway so gigantic and tyrannical, these men knew well that such powers could never be overthrown, nor even checked, except by creating and bringing into the field antagonist forces that should be able to cope with them. The social fabric of Europe, especially of France, was seen to be approaching a crisis of amazing interest and importance, when the whole frame must be shaken, and perhaps brought to the ground; and it was no less obvious, that then would be the time to set up a new dynasty of opinion in religion, in morals, and in politics.

Christianity, as represented in the Papal Church for many centuries, and as it then stood forth in the character and practices of that community, whoever might be the jurors, if they judged impartially, was quite unendurable. It is impossible not to respect those minds that felt and determined it to be so, when we consider what were the materials which constituted the ground of their decision. France alone was overrun by 450,000 ecclesiastics of all descriptions; and the rest of Europe nearly in the same proportion. And their influence, on papal and Jesuitical principles, was paramount over the wide community, with the trifling exception of the ground recovered by the Protestant reformation. It was not to be expected that this reformation would be appreciated in such a state of things, by those who were born and educated where they could see little else bearing the Christian name but those who carried on their foreheads the baptism of Rome.

The purpose was therefore conceived, and the deep-laid scheme matured, for undermining and overthrowing the altar and the throne, as they were considered to be indissolubly united—for revolutionizing society throughout Europe. Ha tred of papacy, of its economy, of its doctrines, and of its practices, grew into a hatred of Christianity, because they were all identified. It was impossible that Christianity, in such circumstances, should be judged on its own merits, for they were not seen. Nothing was visible but the cor-

ruptions passing under that name; and it is reasonable to presume, that the spirit of infidelity, in its worst form, as it has been developed in the history and literature of France and Europe within a century past, had for its aliment, its provocation, and its object, these very corruptions, and nothing else. Christianity, in its simplicity and purity, could never have provoked such a spirit; there is no proof in history that it ever has done it. The persecutions of the early ages, under the Roman empire, were not *caused*, however it may be said they were *occasioned*, by Christianity; but it was by *misrepresentation*. It is not true to say, that the human heart is fairly characterized by the grosser forms of evil which Christianity has been doomed to encounter in earlier or later ages; for the human heart is always the same; and we now find, that since Christianity has had more favourable opportunities of being tried on its own merits, and of being appreciated, the world, which for the most part is still unrenewed by its grace, has turned in its favour. Mankind can and will approve of Christianity when they understand what it is. That is, their judgments and their consciences will approve of it, as best for society, and best for the formation of individual character, although their hearts may rebel against its requirements as made upon them personally in relation to God. The theory of Christianity, as a whole and in particular, is every way calculated to secure the favour of society, wherever it is understood, as the present

state of the Christian world abundantly evinces; and no community, thus enlightened, could ever be brought to array itself against it.

It was the abuses of religion, and the corruptions of Christianity alone, which gave birth to that terrible conception and purpose of overthrowing it, the eruption of which, in France, a little less than half a century ago, startled and amazed the civilized world, dissolved society in the place of its breaking out, and, for a while, seemed to have opened the bottomless pit, and let loose its most malicious spirits, to prowl through the habitations and to control the counsels of men.

The evil to be overcome was great, and the effort must be proportionate. Papal Rome was all-powerful; and the hand lifted to oppose, to be successful, must be more than equal. The hierarchy was subtle; and the enemy, to cope with it on its own ground, must be no less crafty. The papacy commanded the learning of the age; the infidelity, organizing to conflict with it, must not be behind in such magazines. Literature and the press were seized by this assailant; wit pointed its shafts of ridicule, and sped them in all directions on the too many exposed and vulnerable points of its hated object; every department of society was inundated with torrents of corruption to oppose corruption; fiend encountered fiend; and Paris was the Pandemonium. "And I looked, and behold, a pale horse! and his name that sat on him was Death! and hell followed with him!"

The tragedy of infidelity enacted in France, as the *dénouement* of the tragical history of papal Rome, will be an everlasting cure for both. It was a wound on the head of the beast which caused him to stagger; and though he be long reeling to fall, he must fall. It is no less certain, that human society will never again intrust its interests to such an engine of destruction, unless it be to finish the work of death on the surviving parts and members of its grand antagonist. The reign of infidelity, with these contingent restrictions, it may be presumed, is over. It tried Great Britain, and it tried our country; but it tried in vain. We know not how to account for its progress in Germany; it changed its form, however. Once admitted into society, and diffused through its literature, it was too subtle an agent to be speedily ejected. But, since its first irruption on the world, its force has been gradually declining.

We see, however, in this review, that it was not religion, but the faults of religionists, that gave birth to infidelity; and that is its perpetual, and, as we think, its only aliment, so long as it lasts.

Possibly there may be other causes, but history does not reveal them. Wherever we find Deism proper, systematic, principled, an inquiry into its provocations and material of sustentation will, if we mistake not, uniformly conduct us to this source. Certainly it was so in the great effort. Of that there cannot be a question; and the ele-

ments of its composition and its sympathies are substantially the same in all times and places. They who have set themselves against Christianity have overlooked it, and based their objections on the vices developed in the religious world. What infidel ever found fault with the character of Jesus Christ? or with the morality of Christianity? or with its theism? or with any proper feature of the system, unadulterated, uncorrupted, and properly understood in its relations? There may have been criticisms and objections from that quarter, touching some of the interpretations given to parts of Christianity by sectarians. But these are not peculiar to infidelity. We have yet to learn that any of the masters of the infidel school have ever objected to the true theory of Christianity, to its morality, to its theism, or to the character of Christ, so far as to base their opposition upon it. On the contrary, we know very well, that when any of them have obtained a glimpse of the true history of the Messiah, through the mists of their prejudices or the storm of their passions, they have been filled with admiration; and that some of them have opened their eyes so far, and been so honest, as to approve of the principles of Christianity, as a model of character and a basis of society. The preference given, and the respect rendered to Christianity, at this time, by the deistical philosophers of Germany, are based on a comparison drawn in its favour against all other religious systems.

French infidelity, as developed in the great catastrophe, the object of which was to overthrow Christianity and annihilate its influence, spent its force in a very brief period; and soon became essentially modified in its temper, and coolly settled down into a philosophical system, reckless of any specific or capital design. The same general reasonings prevailed both in the British and American school for a while, and simply resulted in producing and nourishing a disrespect for Christianity, until the arguments had been encountered in the open field, and the philosophy demolished; since which Christianity has gradually risen in public esteem, and is at last so well enthroned in the good opinion of the British and American communities, that a decent, well-bred man is rarely, if ever, heard obtruding infidel sentiments in public. No infidel literature of a gross kind, and known to be such, is advertised and sold by a respectable publisher or retailer in England or the United States. Infidelity, for the most part, in these two countries, has descended into the ranks of the ignorant, vicious, profane, and vulgar; and amounts to little more than infidelity of heart. The infamous Carlisle continues, till this hour, for aught we know, to expose by proxy—for we believe he is in prison—in his shop window, Fleet-street, London, "Paine's Age of Reason," "Rights of Man," &c. &c.; but it is remarkable that he always does it in company with caricatures of the abuses of religion in the establishment, such as the enforcement of tithes, church dues,

Rathcormac slaughter, &c., with an effigy of a fat, gowned, and wigged church dignitary, supported on his right by his Satanic majesty, and on his left by a tithe proctor. The latter part of the exhibition, however, we believe, has been ordered away by the municipal authorities, as a public nuisance. It only shows, that the very little of infidelity which dares to show its head is connected with religious abuses, and based upon them. Robert Owen, not long since, and perhaps still, could collect around his infidel rostrum a few ignorant and vulgar heads, and lecture to them on the known faults to be found in the religious world, as proof that all religion is an imposture; and so could Fanny Wright, in New-York and other cities of the United States. These lectures, as is well known, are still kept up by unwashed artificers and others of their class. But the grand theme is the abuses of religion, mingled with profanity. They cannot rise to any thing else; there is little or no philosophy in the infidelity of the present time, because philosophic and cultivated minds are ashamed to have to do with it. It is an infidelity of heart, and not of mind. There is no system in it—no plan—no ulterior design, that is likely to affect the public, any farther than the corrupting influence of such assemblies, of such harangues, and of such characters, can conveniently extend. If the religious world were faultless, all the material of their argument would be taken away. But it happens, unfortunately, that there are many facts of this class so obvious that every-

body sees them; and the ignorant and vicious are powerfully influenced by them.

Papal communities have their own peculiar character, in the light of our present topic. We think that most of them are destined to pass through a severe and critical ordeal in the way of expurgation; and that an infidelity, like that which desolated France, threatens to give them a shaking. Conjectures, however, in such a matter, are of little account, and it is folly to hazard them in any specific forms. Changes in society are more rapid now than formerly; and the terrible catastrophe of France may serve as a beacon to other papal countries, that when they can no longer stay a reformation, they may suffer and control it without an equally calamitous convulsion. But the tendencies are in that direction. The character of the infidelity of any Christian country, in the subtlety of its philosophy, in its social influence, and in its power over the public mind, may ordinarily be estimated and measured very exactly by the subtlety and power of the religious abuses which have provoked it into being, and against which it is arrayed. The two classes of evils are always antagonist elements, sustaining the relation of parent and child—and the vigour of the offspring depends on that of the power that produced it for the time being.

Neither do Protestant communities present uniform aspects in the light of this subject, for the

reason that their social elements are differently combined and modified in relation to Christianity. But they are all essentially free, so far as religion is concerned. The religion of Protestant Germany is mild; and so is its infidelity. The former is allied to their philosophy, and their philosophy to their infidelity; so that there is little or no quarrel between them. What will be the result of this singular state of things, it may not be so easy to predict. They profess to be a Christian and a Protestant community; their fathers were rocked in the cradle of the Reformation; they are the best educated people in the world; and their scholarship in the Christian Scriptures takes the lead of all Christian nations; but such has been the growth and such the modifications of their philosophy, that their respect for Christianity is to a great extent based upon its merits and claims as compared with other religions, and not as being of Divine origin. Such, we understand, are their prevalent impressions, although there are doubtless many sincere and thorough-going Christians among them. Their religion and philosophy are well accommodated to each other. They have no fanaticism, and are enthusiastic only as men of letters and as philosophers. But it is understood that pure Christianity is reviving among them; and it may reasonably be believed, that their philosophy, so far as it is of an infidel character, will gradually be supplanted, without violence, by the growing influence of vital piety. As there are few abuses of religion

among them to complain of, their infidelity is rather of a cool, speculative character, neither virulent nor active—and, being purely philosophical, may be expected to yield to the claims of a vital Christianity, as we believe these claims are substantial and paramount, and only require a fair opportunity in such a state of society to obtain that influence for which they are designed. These remarks on Germany may appear superficial, and might, perhaps, as well have been spared, as the author does not profess a very intimate or thorough acquaintance with their state of society.

The infidelity of Great Britain also corresponds with the state of society. British Christians were very justly alarmed during the reign and ravages of French infidelity, as there were many powerful and philosophic minds among them that betrayed symptoms of a deep sympathy with their frantic neighbours, and took up the pen in the same cause. But the battle was soon over, and the consequence has been a complete triumph of Christianity. The Christian literature of Great Britain, on this topic and all others, is the richest and strongest in the world. As a vindication of Christianity against the assaults of infidelity in all forms, it may be pronounced complete. Nothing remains to be done. The effect upon the community has been to silence effectually, and we may presume for ever, all open infidelity among respectable classes. All profound thinkers and well-read people are acquainted with their own infidel classics, if it be proper to dignify

them with such a name, and with the same class of writings from the Continent; some of whom, doubtless, are tinctured with the leaven. But public opinion so decidedly frowns upon infidelity, that few have the moral courage even to betray a leaning in that direction, if they feel it.

Doubtless there is a great deal of practical infidelity in Great Britain; and it is supposed very extensively to pervade the lower orders. But this is obviously owing to the abuses of religion, which they witness under the operation of the Church Establishment, or the union of Church and State. So far as there is infidelity in the higher ranks, it may fairly be ascribed to the want of a suitable example and proper ministerial influence in the dignified and independently-endowed clergy. They have all been educated together, or in sight of each other; they know each other's history; and there are too many clergymen in the established Church of England and Ireland, whose example and influence, from the very nature of such a system, cannot be very salutary over the numerous minds around them of equal cultivation. The only wonder is, that there is so little infidelity among the higher orders in such a state of things.

In all the forms under which infidelity appears among the lower classes, it comes out professedly based on what are regarded as the abuses of religion—and not without reason. The common people cannot reconcile the pomp and state of the dignified clergy, and the burden of such an establish-

ment as they feel its pressure on their shoulders, with the life, character, and ministry of Jesus Christ and of his apostles. Hence they dislike religion, and are inclined to the side of infidelity—not from any examination or understanding of the merits and claims of Christianity, but simply and solely from these facts, in the shape of what appear to them abuses of religion. We believe it true to say, that there is no infidelity in Great Britain of any consequence that is not owing to this cause, as it exists and operates on the public mind in one form or another. It is only wonderful that the public of that kingdom, of all classes, distinguish so much and so well as they do between Christianity and abuses that pass under its name; for, manifestly, notwithstanding the abundant provocations for ill-humour on that account, there is a high respect for Christianity pervading that community—a respect which cannot be shaken or disturbed, and which is quite inconsistent with the supposition that infidelity, of the old and philosophical type, professedly based upon objections to the theory and subject-matter of Christianity, extensively prevails.

Neither is it any less apparent that infidelity in the United States is owing to the faults of religionists—and principally to faults that are the growth of our own soil. Infidelity here has been constantly changing its character with the change of phenomena in our religious world—or with the

changes in the developments of our religion—and these, as need not be said, have been somewhat rapid, in many respects novel, and rather extraordinary. The type of infidelity in any community will always correspond with the character of its provocations, which, in our opinion, are never Christianity itself, but abuses and corruptions passing under that name. Certainly, in the present state of public opinion, Christianity is not an object of disrespect; and we have already given reasons to show that it never has been, when viewed without prejudice in its own proper character. Admitting even, if any choose to have it so, that infidelity, with pure Christianity as its object, has existed among us, it has long since passed away from the public mind of this country as an influential element. Who ever sees it in the productions of our press, that are of a higher order? Who ever hears it in respectable society? A single glance at this negative fact is sufficient to determine the question. The infidelity of low and vulgar minds is Fanny-Wright infidelity—incapable of appreciating the claims of Christianity—never rises so high, but feeds on the sins of religionists—the very thing we are attempting to show.

It happens that there is no little aliment of this kind among us, which must seriously affect the wide community, high and low, rich and poor, cultivated and uncultivated. It does not generally disturb the respect that is entertained for Christianity, except

with uninformed minds; but the effect of it is to narrow the pale of professing Christians, to keep back those who would honour the Christian name, and be essential aids to the Christian cause. It produces a pause in those who are well disposed towards Christianity, and prevents their becoming decided and active Christians. It is not an opposition to Christianity itself, nor to its essential truths, but a disgust towards fanatical practices and factitious standards of Christian character; a mere reluctance of feeling to fall into such ranks —to be in such company.

The author is quite aware that the last remark will rouse a certain feeling extensively prevalent among ardent religionists, and give them a plausible defence. It is a popular and influential cant, that overlooks entirely the present state of society, not regarding "the signs of the times," viz., that the world were opposed to Christ, opposed to the apostles, and have been opposed to Christians in all ages. "If ye were of the world, the world would love its own. But because you are not of the world, and I have chosen you out of the world, therefore the world hateth you." It refuses to distinguish between general historical truths, belonging to particular periods, which are of course accidental and variable, and truths which are always the same. We have before shown that the present state of society is favourable to Christianity, and to the proper exemplifications of Christian character; and it needs

only to be mentioned to be seen and appreciated, that a public profession of religion, in these days, in any of the usual forms, if believed to be sincere and conscientious—which is always taken for granted, unless appearances contradict—does not injure any persons in the estimation of the world around; but rather gives them a higher, stronger, more influential character in the community. It is not a "cross," but rather a "crown," before the public. It results entirely from that favourable opinion generally entertained in society towards religion and a pure religious character, as asserted and maintained in our previous pages; and it is a wide mistake to assume the contrary. It is mistaking the age in which we live; it is refusing to open the eyes on the changing and brightening aspects of God's providential government of the world; it denies facts, or misinterprets them; it gives to friends the name of enemies, and treats them as hostile; it makes the worst of the best state of things; it buries itself in abstract theories, which, however applicable once, are not applicable now; it is a disease of the mind, a morbid feeling, which can never see things as they are; which stalks through society with the blustering airs of reforming pretensions, living on excitement, and dying whenever it is over. The truth is, society is already far in advance of its theories, and is kept back by its interference.

Not to speak of other faults of religionists, on which the irreligion of the land feeds and nour-

ishes itself,—pity we had not thought of the term irreligion before, to use it in the place of infidelity, as we have so little of the latter among us,—the various forms of fanaticism, which have recently raged so widely and furiously through the community, have brought the entire irreligious world to a pause. By the irreligious we mean to designate those who have not publicly professed religion in the usual form, although many of them are, doubtless, as conscientious Christians as we have among us, and might justly complain of being thus ranked. But it is common to make this distinction between the religious and irreligious parts of the community, not necessarily implying, however, that the latter are not, to a great extent, religiously educated; or that they have no conscience formed by the light of Christianity; or that a large portion of them are not honest inquirers after truth; or that some of them may not be real Christians; but only, that they have not generally become the subjects of renovating grace, which, with suitable evidence of its existence, is very properly made the basis of distinction between those who are and are not in heart the disciples and friends of the Saviour. It must be admitted, that this irreligion is not infidelity in the proper sense of the term, inasmuch as the great body of our people, who are not professedly religious, do yet respect the theory and admit the claims of Christianity. It is undoubtedly true, that we have very little infidelity in the country; and what little we have is principally

nourished and sustained by the spectacle of religious extravagances, and other faults to be found in the religious world.

We say, then, that the extensive prevalence of fanaticism has brought the irreligious world to a pause; and, in our opinion, the cause of Christianity must remain in check till the reign of these spurious and unhealthful excitements has subsided. Enthusiasts, not to say fanatics, are constantly obtruding such wild projects of reformation upon the public, and bringing forward so many new associations to claim public patronage, and are so bold and noisy, that more discreet Christians, however desirous of doing good, can neither be seen nor heard in this state of things. They are compelled to lie by upon their arms till the heat of these disturbances is over; at least, their comparatively noiseless and unostentatious career is inadequate to satisfy the demand for excitement that has been created. Moreover, the sober part of the community will keep back; they will join in no enterprise for the general good; because, by these exhibitions, they are disgusted and prejudiced against all efforts of the kind. Even the ministers of religion cannot now call sinners to repentance in an earnest manner, without being suspected of fanaticism. They are robbed of their appropriate moral power by these excesses; the edge of truth in their hands is blunted, and the sword of the Spirit turned backwards; the Gospel loses its proper efficacy in the minds and hearts of the public; and

sinners decline the offers of salvation by stumbling on the stone of fanaticism, which everywhere lies in their path. They find an apology for their own sins in this sin of the religious. By setting up a false standard of religion, the world say very justly—"We do not understand it." To gain the transient reputation of reformers, fanatics consent to enact the part of Jesuits.

S

CHAPTER XI.

The truth should be told.

"But though these things be so, they should not be told." This is a false maxim in the present state of society. The world see and know it all; their eyes cannot be blinded. We have not told a single thing in this book that is true, which the world has not discovered long before; and what is not true, though the author may have thought it so, if it is likely to have influence, somebody will show to be false, and its influence will be barred.

There has been a principle extensively recognised by religious reformers in our country as a step preparatory to a revival of religion. It is to bring the Church to a confession of their faults before the world. However we might demur to the manner in which this is sometimes done, there cannot be a doubt that it involves a correct and sound principle of philosophy. And the effects that have been produced by it, when a community has been taken by surprise, evince that there is reason and force in it. The faults of the Church have been obvious to the world, and so also, it may be, have the faults of its individual members; and when both together, the Church as a body and individuals as such, have publicly and with apparent

sincerity confessed them, the moral effect has been known to be very great and apparently good. We speak not in commendation of this practice in such cases, because, as a part of a system of measures for producing excitement, it soon gets to be understood, is suspected as a trick, and loses its influence. We simply refer to it for the purpose of illustration, to show that the principle is a truly philosophical one when properly applied; and we believe that it applies most fairly and safely to the subject now in hand.

There is not a single fault of material consequence appertaining to the religious and reforming enterprises of the day, to which we have or have not alluded, that has not been detected by the eye of the public; or at least suspected by certain symptoms. Nor are the most common faults of religionists as they belong to individuals, or of the religious world as they belong to the body generally, out of sight. "Ye are a city set on a hill."

The defects, then, are seen; they cannot be concealed. And the natural, the unavoidable consequence on the public is, to awaken disrespect and destroy confidence. If they stand unconfessed; much more if they are tolerated; still more if they are excused and vindicated, will the public revolt, become disgusted, and withdraw all sympathy. Those on whom the faults rest will cease to respect themselves; society is injured, and the results are very unhappy. No public institution, that is dependant on public favour, can prosper after it

has lost public confidence; neither can an individual, after he has ceased to be respected. Look at the Church of Rome: she will not confess her faults, and the world despises her. The society of Jesuits has never repented; it is therefore universally reprobated. Several religious and other societies in our country, that have become derelict in principle, have gone down with all their sins upon their heads. Some, now apparently in vigorous action, are annually deserted by crowds, who, seeing their defects, become disgusted, and their places are supplied by recruits drummed up for a season, who also will soon give place to others, till the sources of supply are exhausted, and the interests can no longer be sustained. The doom of ultimate failure is inevitable, where the faults are obvious, unconfessed, and unrepented. The chief secretaries and agents may hold on so long as there are funds to support them; they may renew their appeals, and drag out an unnatural life; but if there be not worth in the institutions, if their powers are abused, or if there be any other palpable defects, and no confession of them—no reformation—the public will see it, and let them die.

On the contrary, let the public be convinced that the cause of any religious or other association is a good one, and they will sustain it, while it is in the hands of uncorrupt, faithful, and efficient agents. Every fault that is exposed, confessed, and abandoned, will only increase their confidence. It is blindness, infatuation, and certain

ruin to attempt to conceal or justify faults that are obvious.

"But," it will perhaps be said, "there are some faults that are not obvious; why diminish public confidence by exposing them? Why injure a good cause by alarming the public?" Suppose the faults are fundamental—that the principles of Jesuitism are at work? Shall they be permitted to go on? No matter what they are: if they are visible, they should stand confessed; if Jesuitical and concealed, they should be exposed.

"But, if the public should be convinced that these institutions are so corrupt, they will be abandoned, and all go down. You confess that the several objects proposed by them are good and important. How, then, are they ever to be accomplished? Society and the world will go to ruin, if no confidence can be placed in agencies of this kind."

As to the last point, stated by this supposed interlocutor and querist, our own mind, to our great comfort, has been emancipated from the thraldom of these alarmists; or rather, we have had the good fortune never to have been under it. We do not believe that the world is going to ruin, or society going backward. We have more faith in God; we believe in the Bible; we have seen the Christian system making its way in the world for eighteen hundred years, against all forms of evil, from the grosser to the more subtle, triumphing in every stage of its march, never retrograding, but

always advancing, by direct or indirect influence, collecting strength in times of trial, gaining advantage in the midst of apparent defeat, gathering materials for re-edification out of the mass of its supposed ruins, shining brighter and brighter in contrast with the corruptions and malepractices that have grown out of the abuse of its name and sanctions, acquiring the confidence of mankind from age to age, till, at last, it stands enthroned in the favour and good opinion of the world. It occupies a position, at this moment, in the respect and affections of mankind, which cannot be disturbed by any power of earth or hell—by any assaults of its open enemies, or by any defections of its pretended friends. And this system comprehends all the principles essential to the reformation of society, to the renovation of the world; it was promulged for this end; in its silent operations it has ever been tending, though unseen, yet not less certainly, to this result; every stage of its advancement has a firmer footing than the preceding; every display of its unstained banner—unstained with corruption, though red with the great atoning sacrifice—is loftier and more attractive over the field:—It is borne by the unseen hand. God forbid that Christianity should depend on the extemporaneous devices, ever shifting as the wind, of a few combinations of a few individuals, themselves none too good, who may dream themselves deputed, or may claim, to control its interests! Allow any reasonable importance, as ordinarily claimed

by their most zealous supporters and advocates, to all the religious and reforming societies that have been organized in Christendom for fifty years past, independent of the Church of God, and let them all be blotted from the map of the religious world to-day, and for ever cease to be,—the foundations of Christianity, as seated in the affections of mankind, would not be shaken a whit. We say not that the career of Christianity would be more unembarrassed, and its prospects brightened; that, possibly, may be a question; it is enough that the Christian cause is not materially dependant upon them. It is enough that there is an attachment in the community to the principles of the Christian system, as now understood, which holds them dear and precious; that kings and princes, and governors and statesmen, and all well-wishers of mankind, who occupy influential stations, have learned to feel their dependance on the grace and sanctions of the Christian religion for the well-being of society—for all that is most desirable and most dear to man, as a denizen of this world, and as a candidate for the next. It is a mistake, an arrogant pretension, that the great work of reforming the world is vested in the hands of a few self-elected, self-controlled, and irresponsible associations of individuals, claiming for themselves exclusive rights and an exclusive sway over the public mind —and denouncing, with uncompromising temerity, all rival claims, even from the Church of God.

Christianity was given in trust to the Church

for the benefit of mankind. It is the property of the world—of the great public. The interpretation of its designs, and the invention of the modes of its operation, are not the growth of a day, nor of an age, nor of many ages. It was not left for one generation, much less for an elect few of that generation, to discover what it is, and prescribe how its interests are to be managed. Novel views and novel measures relating to Christianity, grow-up as in a night, are, on that very account, suspicious. In the present state of society, it is not a few, but the community at large, who are most competent to determine the expedient modes of maintaining and advancing the interests of Christianity. A sudden and complete change in the economy of society is a revolution; and the sober and reflecting will judge how far the modern modes of religious and reforming enterprise are of this character; and whether they are, in all respects, an improvement.

At any rate, it cannot be doubted that Christianity has obtained such a footing in the world as to be entirely independent of such accidents as we are now contemplating. All these societies may come and go, may live or die, the foundations of Christianity are still firm and strong; its march is onward; and the Church of the living God is secure. The Christian community proper, and the public generally, with which it is connected by a common sympathy, are ever ready to patronise

Christian enterprise based on catholic principles; but we trust and hope they will never surrender their conscience and judgment to sectarian pretensions—or to new, extravagant, and fanatical measures. Certain we are, that a fair exposure of new and extraordinary religious doings, originated and managed in closeted combinations, in themselves startling to sober minds, asserting high and special claims, overlooking the real state of society, and acting on fictitious grounds, cannot be injurious.

The truth of the matter, in its broadest light, is, that most of our reformers and reforming societies are behind the public, holding them back when they think they are leading the way, and drawing them forward—or rather *driving* them. They first declare the public enemies to reform; next, treat them as such; then go to battling with them; put themselves and all the world out of temper; and at this stage exclaim, in the sweat and passion of their enterprise, "What a mighty work is in our hand! and what a glorious victory awaits us! 'We must display column, and meet the enemy.'"

The religious reformer says, "The way to convert sinners is to make them 'mad'"—angry. And he goes to work accordingly, and succeeds well. He makes them "mad"—stirs up a host of opposition, and this is the test of his fidelity! The temperance reformer says to his neighbour, "Give me the keeping of your conscience, sir. I do not think you are competent for the trust. Let me be your

guardian, as you cannot take care of yourself. Vow to me that you will never taste another drop of wine, beer, cider, &c.; and then, I think, you will be safe." But now and then he meets with an objector to this proposal, who has the vanity and assurance to think he can keep his own conscience, and that it is his own proper business. And behold! he is an enemy to the Temperance reformation! "The world is opposed to us. We must meet the foe in open field."

Surely, that must be a very willing public that has yielded so extensively to the Temperance reformers on such principles; and the poor sinners that can bear such browbeating to bring them to repentance—who allow themselves to be fairly fisted into it—as is known to have been widely and liberally dealt out to them for a few years past in this land, must be meekness itself.

We think the time has come when the advocates of a sound and healthful reformation, when enlightened Christians, and the public generally, must feel a high and solemn obligation imposed upon them to endeavour to rescue the guardianship of public morals, and the interests of the Christian cause, from bad hands.

The author must be permitted to maintain that Christianity is not injured, but benefited, by the exposure of the faults of religionists and of religious societies; that these are the principal, if not the only, obstacles now in the way of the triumphs

of the Christian system. We have shown, in a former chapter, that they are the aliment and support of infidelity; that they have ever been its provocation.

If it could be shown that Christianity is now in a stage, or particular crisis of its history, where its credit and currency in the world depend solely or principally on the concealment of such faults—that their disclosure would be a serious shock to the cause, or the ruin of it—the case would be different. But we know it to be matter of fact, that the blackest possible enormities have been committed under the sanction of nominal Christian institutions, and by nominal Christian hands, as in the Papal Church; and all the world knows it. Bad things have been enacted in other quarters, professedly under the same high authority. But the world has long since learned how to distinguish between these crimes and the religion in whose name they have been committed. More especially, as before proved, does society now discriminate. The general credit of Christianity in the world is established; nevertheless, there are always a vast many minds less informed who are witnesses of these foibles; and who, as an apology for their own non-compliance with the requisitions of the Gospel on themselves personally, or for not lending their influence and contributions to the Christian cause, are disposed to identify them with the Christian religion. "And is this the religion," say they, "producing such fruits, which you call upon us to respect, embrace, and obey?"

It must be evident that there is no answer to this objection, except by showing that these faults have no connexion with Christianity—except by disclaiming sympathy and participation with them. Just in proportion as they are public, they must be publicly exposed, condemned, and repudiated. It must be shown that Christianity disclaims all responsibility in such transactions; and that none detest them so thoroughly as Christians themselves. Then, and then only, are such objections disarmed.

It is conceived that we have arrived at a stage in the history of Christianity, when such exposures and repudiations are among the most indispensable and essential helps to the cause; and that these faults are the grand obstacle. In their moral influence generally as a class, they are the chief hinderance. But those faults, which it is the principal design of these pages to expose, are the chief obstacle in the constitutional frame of society. There is no getting over without removing them. They are set up as parts of the great machinery of Christianity; they have more or less credit as such; they have usurped the commission and powers of the Christian Church; they have invented and imposed new rules and terms of Christian association; they have concentrated Christian influence to a great extent in the narrow circle of a few self-created managers; and, in consequence of the new principles they have adopted, and the new modes of association they have prescribed, they have constructed the frame of religious society ex-

tensively upon a new basis—upon a basis which constitutes themselves the source of law, and of all economical measures. They evidently meditate the entire control of the religious concerns of the community, not to say, of the world.

It need not be said that such a new frame of society is formidable; and if such an organization be vicious, as being entirely independent of the grand commission which Jesus Christ gave to his own community for the conversion of the world, and as usurping its principal and vital powers, it is a deep-laid and constitutional fault—a scheme of no ordinary character. With such a spectacle before their eyes, the Christian world will doubtless be advised by the history of "The Society of Jesus." They will not think it immaterial whether they should understand the constitutional tendencies of such institutions, and anticipate the results of their operations.

Independent of this new state of things, we should have said, that the world seems now prepared for some signal conquests by Christianity; that the door is opened for a rapid and triumphant march towards the consummation of its aims. But lo! a new and subtle development of evil hath arisen, based indeed, as will easily be recognised, on an old principle, but rising in gigantic form, and stretching out its arms to embrace all, and control every thing. Let the world be challenged to distinguish between the principle of these organizations and that of the school of Ignatius Loyola.

For ourselves, we cannot discover the difference; we believe them to be identical.

The theory which the author ventured to propose in a former chapter, viz., that the forms of evil which Christianity has to encounter are ordinarily found to pass in gradation from the grosser to the more subtle, if it be worthy of respect, may perhaps assist in indicating what is likely to be the final development of this kind, that will require to be subdued and removed out of the way. The grosser forms are those which assail the lives of Christians in the various modes that have been adopted. Torture in all its varieties might be set down as a second class. Deprivation of civil rights another. The persecution raised by unfavourable opinion, and made to bear oppressively on its objects, is one. Heresy and the application of false philosophy are forms more subtle. The history of the Papal Church presents a complication of evils, endlessly diversified, from the most gross to the most refined. Fanaticism is a subtle form. But how could Satan have transformed himself more completely into an angel of light, or succeeded better in deceiving the very elect, than in the Jesuitical schools of all ages, as each has been characterized in the beginning of its history? This form itself has proceeded from the more gross to the more subtle. In the Papal Church it has been gradually refining, till now it is comparatively innocent in its external features. An accomplished

Jesuit in that connexion adapts himself most adroitly to the opinions of society, wherever he may be. He is all things to all men. He offends not the high standard of opinion in Britain or America. As an association, the principles of their external conduct are unimpeachable. No class of Christian ministers in the world are more exemplary in the self-denying, laborious, and painful duties of their office; in catechetical instruction, in preaching, in pastoral labours of every description, in visiting the sick, in consoling the dying; in missionary labours among the cultivated and the rude, in civilized and barbarous nations, "compassing sea and land to make one proselyte"—and all to serve the policy of the papal hierarchy. Had not history disclosed the principles of their school, who could question the sincerity and purity of their apostleship? And some of them doubtless are sincere and pure. Is it possible for a system to be more perfect, more artful, more like in external semblances to the primitive model of the Christian ministry—more admirably adapted to impose upon the world? And yet we know it is a part of a vast and complicated system of worldly policy, designed to bring and hold the world in subjection to the spiritual supremacy of the pope. It is the subtlety of all subtleties—the consummation of human wisdom

In the same manner, we find that a system of spiritual supremacy over the public is organizing in our country, under a form so plausible, and a zeal so commendable, in its professed and ap-

parent design, that common observation is not likely to detect its subtle and insinuating character. Already in the Temperance reformation, so called, has it acquired a complete ascendency over the consciences and judgment of one half of the community, more or less, and laid its claims on the other half. The cause is apparently a good one; and is so successfully involved in extravagant statements, in misrepresentation and discolouring of facts, in false theories, and in the subtleties of argument founded upon them, while the other side of the questions started is seldom if ever heard, that ordinary discernment is completely confounded. The public, who have no interest in opposing such a reformation, but rather in supporting it, so long as it may seem good, readily yield to the overwhelming influence of authority. They believe for the same reasons that the disciples of papacy do:—They respect their teachers, and have no means of disproving their statements.

The leaders of this and other kindred institutions have discovered, what is an undoubted fact, —and which, in itself, is a most hopeful state of society, a providential facility for the attainment of the greatest good to man,—that the temper of the age is favourable to great public movements for the reformation of morals and the advancement of the interests of Christianity; and they have eagerly seized the opportunity to monopolize the influence which it affords, and to use it in their own way,

The whole of this movement, in its various forms, is so like what is good, so plausible, having so much of reason to support it (and it must be allowed that all the objects proposed are in fact good, worthy of patronage, and most important), that criticism on the modes of attaining them, and on the tendencies of these organizations, will, doubtless, be extensively unwelcome and obnoxious. But these matters have come to such a crisis, and this influence has become so overbearing, that sobriety itself may well feel the kindlings of anxiety, and rouse from its slumbers. It is, we are inclined to think, certainly to hope, the last form of evil which Christianity may have to contend with—a form so subtle, as to seem an apostle in zeal, and an angel in purity.

CHAPTER XII.

Temperance doings at Saratoga, August, 1836.

It is a singular coincidence, that, while the author is in the midst of this volume, and just as he had risen from recording the last sentence of the chapter immediately preceding this, the doings of the Temperance Convention, and of the Ninth Annual Meeting of the American Temperance Society, held at time and place as above designated, should be laid upon his table, to disclose, in actual history, a fulfilment and proof, not to say the consummation, of that course of events which has given rise to the doctrine and allegations of these pages. Here it is—all, several and complete! The purpose is at last revealed—openly declared, in set phrase—explained, defended, sealed! All farther debate is foreclosed; the question, and all questions pertaining thereunto, are settled; and the people of these United States, and, as we suppose, of all nations, are henceforth doomed to a silent, uncomplaining, submissive acquiescence in the decree that has gone forth! There was a struggle, indeed—a battling of arms with arms—an effort of some noble minds to stay the final act. But it was predetermined in the conclave; it had long been aimed at; the preparation had been a

work of years; the developments, though gradual, have been sufficiently manifest; and it was thought the time had come when the blow might be struck.

The community had begun to think; symptoms of uneasiness under the yoke had been betrayed; rebellion in high quarters was threatened; discipline was not maintained through all the ranks; many who had obeyed the crack of the whip, or the lifting of the driver's elbow, and worked well for a season, were evidently getting out of gear; although forbidden "rum," they thought themselves entitled to wine, beer, cider, &c., and began, as was thought, to indulge to excess. These latter beverages were even restored to the table, whence they had been removed; some, who had delivered speeches on the platform in favour of abstinence, had begun to drink toasts in wine in favour of liberty. Even clergymen, who could afford it, had again put wine on their tables; and not a few of the Temperance-pledged ranks, who could give a good dinner, averred, as they set the decanter before their guests, that they were not Tee-totallers.

Nevertheless, the efforts already made had gained a point; the hundreds of thousands of tracts, papers, magazines, and volumes distributed, had enlightened the public mind; and the principal secretaries, agents, sub-agents, and auxiliary societies, were well marshalled, through whom a certain quantum of the community could be relied upon to go all lengths. It was believed that a

spiritual supremacy had been acquired over the public mind by these means, so long in use and so industriously applied, that a final push for an uncontrolled sway might be hazarded. At any rate, it was *now* or *never*.

Who would believe, that in this boasted land of liberty—we are ashamed to use this hackneyed phrase, but if pertinent anywhere it is so here,—that in this refuge and asylum of the free, purchased and defended at such cost for the privilege of thinking, for the rights of conscience, and for all the social advantages secured by the charter so long our pride and darling treasure, bestowed by Heaven and won with blood—who *could* believe that a self-constituted spiritual power would arise among us so soon, to say, "Hitherto have ye come, but ye shall go no farther; the bounds of your freedom are decreed; henceforth ye shall not think; ye shall not have, ye shall not give, an opinion; or, if ye presume so to do, it shall be of no avail; your judgment is foreclosed; ye stand before our bar convicted criminals; ye are outlaws!"

Such are the decisions of the Temperance Convention of Saratoga for 1836. "We are not here," said one of the speakers on that occasion, "to pass resolutions of proscription, and send them forth as so many popish bulls, or ecclesiastical anathemas, denouncing our fellow-men—men as upright and as conscientious as ourselves;" and

yet those resolutions were passed. They are as follows :—

"*Resolved*, That as intoxicating liquor is a 'mocker' in proportion as men use it as a beverage, they will not be likely to judge concerning the propriety of thus using it, as they would judge should they not use it."

Or thus :—

"*Resolved*, That as intoxicating liquor is 'a mocker,' it is to be feared that those who come under its influence will often not judge concerning the propriety of using it as a beverage, as they would judge should they not [use it] come under its power."

The first of these copies, we believe, was the original draught; and is, on the whole, most perspicuous. We are not quite sure that the second is the exact form under which it was finally passed; but think it is near to it. As we shall see by-and-by, some efforts were made, first, to throw out the resolution; and afterward, to amend it. If we have not the exact words, it is only because we have been a little embarrassed by the different statements which appear in the reports of the progress of the discussion. We have at least got what parliamentarians call "the principle of the bill." The other resolution which we propose to notice reads as follows :—

"*Resolved*, That as the [prevailing] use of intoxicating liquor. as a beverage, tends not only to produce and aggravate diseases, but to render them hereditary, and thus to deteriorate the human race; as it often produces a predisposition to insanity, and is, in many cases, the manifest cause of that distressing malady;

as it occasions an immense loss of property, and of social and domestic enjoyment; as it weakens the power of motives over the human mind to do right, and increases the power of motives to do wrong; as it tends to blind the understanding, sear the conscience, pollute the affections, harden the heart, and debase all the powers of man; as it produces most of the pauperism and crimes in the community; tends to prevent the purity and permanence of free institutions, and all the inestimable benefits which they are adapted to impart; as it tends also to hinder the efficacy of the gospel, and all means for the intellectual elevation, the moral purity, the social happiness, and the eternal good of men; as it tends to shorten human life, and to ruin the souls of men, *it does not appear to be right* that men should so use it, or furnish it to be so used by others; and we cannot but hope that enlightened friends of humanity will do neither."

There were in all *thirty* resolutions passed by this convention, the importance of some of which would not be so obvious at first sight. We shall possibly refer to some others of them before we have done.

The Jesuitical character, the comprehensive scope, and the tremendous sweep of the two here submitted, can be discerned and appreciated only by some knowledge of the history and principles of the Temperance Society. At first sight they might seem very innocent to those who have never given their attention to this subject. Verily, it might be asked, What is there in them to hurt or disturb anybody? And such, doubtless, was intended to be the appearance. The artful, but tin-

sel coverings that are drawn over them, just serve to conceal their aim, point, and hideousness, before the eyes of those intended to be insnared or injured, as the case may be; while the immense folds coiled up, and the head, and glaring eye, and darting tongue of the serpent, are as visible to those who understand the subject as if no covering were there.

We will first give our attention to the former of these resolutions, as concocted and framed in the secret counsels of those who manage these concerns: "Resolved, that as intoxicating liquor is 'a mocker' in proportion as men use it as a beverage, they will not be likely to judge concerning the propriety of thus using it, as they would judge should they not use it." The principle of the other form, as finally amended and adopted, is of course identical with this; but the form now before us is more perspicuous and naked; and as it is the one originally framed with the design of being carried, it is fair to accept it as the exact type of the plan and aim of the managers of this society. The features and radical elements of this resolution, or of this bill, as it might with propriety be termed, are sundry and various.

"Intoxicating liquor," it should be understood, in the present creed and parlance of the Temperance Society, comprehends all wines, beer, cider, cordials, or any fermented drinks or artificial compounds whatever, that are exciting, or exhilarating, or stimulating in their effects, however mild in

their character, which are used in society "as beverages." As it is possible for men to become intoxicated with wine, beer, cider, &c., it has been thought proper, by the Temperance reformers, to apply to them the term "intoxicating;" and, philosophically speaking, there is no objection, particularly in application to wine. For popular uses it is rather a stretch to apply it to beer and cider. But as these men are accustomed to stretch matters a little, it is only necessary that we endeavour to understand them. The popular meaning of intoxication is doubtless—drunkenness; and although it would once have been deemed unfair to call every man that uses wine, or cider, or beer, a drunkard, yet that is evidently the term which the Temperance reformers are endeavouring to fasten upon them. In the way to this, as it has been proved that these drinks have in them intoxicating ingredients, if used in sufficient quantities; and as it is known that men have been intoxicated by them, it is assumed that it is proper to call them "intoxicating," which is philosophically true. If, however, we may take the liberty of coining an epithet, they mean by "intoxicating liquor," as appears from their own explanation and avowals, *get-drunk* liquor. And in order therefore to attach the greatest possible odium to the use of these milder beverages, they call them "intoxicating;" by which they are willing to have it understood that there is little distance or difference between drunkenness and the use of them; and that all who do use them in any

degree are properly called *drunkards*. That such is the meaning of the resolution now under consideration, is evident from the Scriptural allusion, by bringing in the word "mocker:"—"Resolved, as intoxicating liquor is a *mocker*," &c.

We need not go into an argument to show, that when Scripture says "Wine is a mocker," &c. it means when used in excess; and not in every degree, and therefore should not be used at all. For it says also:—"Give *strong drink* unto him that is ready to perish (as medicine to restore him); and *wine* to those that be heavy of heart."—"And Melchisedek brought forth bread and *wine* [to meet and refresh Abraham as he 'returned from the slaughter of Chedorlaomer, and of the kings that were with him']; and *he was the priest of the most high God*."—"He watereth the hills . . . . . ; he causeth the grass to grow for the cattle, and herb for the service of man . . . . . ; and *wine* that maketh glad the heart of man." Our Saviour wrought a miracle to produce *wine*—what shall we say, to increase the mirth of a wedding? Was there not enough before? Doubtless he had a higher object; but that was one of the natural consequences. Paul prescribed it to Timothy.

But "wine is a mocker," when men get drunk with it, no doubt; and every fair mind knows that this is the meaning. But these men pervert words, as we shall see yet more. They have resolved beforehand to foreclose judgment—not to hear the other side—to disqualify the witnesses—to arraign

and convict the party on another count; they therefore begin the resolution by an implied charge of the blackest character: All who use wine, or beer, or cider, or any other exhilarating beverage, no matter in what degree, or how seldom, if they ever taste—are *drunkards!* "Resolved, that as *intoxicating liquor is a mocker.*" Observe: they are giving reasons why these witnesses should not be heard—why their opinion should not be respected—*they are not sober men.* And the argument fails entirely, till it is assumed that they who use these beverages are *never* sober, and *can* never be. The resolution sets out, builds its conclusions, on the assumption of two implied false positions, both of the nature of established charges against character: first, of drunkenness; and next, of a disqualification for judgment on that account. All—there is no exception—who drink wine, or cider, or beer, in any degree, are, by one fell swoop, struck from the roll of witnesses and jurors on this great question; and that on the assumption that they are drunkards, and always drunk. For, if they are ever sober, their judgment might be worth something; and it might be supposed that it would even be more valuable, because, in the intervals of their sobriety, the honest testimony of their sad experience should naturally go in favour of abstinence.

The wording of this resolution is not simply a Jesuitical, but we had almost said, a Satanic, subtlety. It arraigns and condemns the best men that have ever lived; the best that now live. It spares

not divinely inspired men; it blots the pages of Revelation; and, as the Rev. Dr. McMasters said, while the resolution was under discussion, "it goes directly to impeach the moral character of the Redeemer of the world!"—"*Resolved*, that as *intoxicating* liquor is a *mocker*, in proportion as men use it as a beverage, they will not be likely to judge concerning the propriety of thus using it, as they would judge should they not use it."

It is true, indeed, that any thing and every thing may be made of this resolution that may suit a Jesuitical design; but there can be no doubt of its intention. It is in fact, as a piece of logic, a mere truism. But it was not designed to be so understood; it was not so understood by the parties on the occasion of its public discussion; it ought not to be so understood; for it had an aim. It was intended to asperse character—to throw out of the pale of a sober community all who use exhilarating beverages of any sort, in any degree. It has in *set terms* impeached and condemned them, without exception, as unworthy of respect in any opinion they shall offer, or in any word they shall say, on this subject.

As a truism, by changing the leading terms, it applies as well to those who framed it as to those for whom it was framed. It does not, indeed, apply to the latter at all. Let us state it once for the benefit of the framers:—Inasmuch as fasting and other severe abstinences, kept up in perpetuity, deprive men of good spirits and make them "heavy

of heart," churlish and misanthropic, "in proportion as" such abstinences are practised; and the more so the longer they are practised; therefore, resolved, that "they will not be likely to judge concerning the propriety" of such abstinences, "as they would judge should they not" practise them.

By the principle of their own resolution, therefore, they are themselves thrown out of the pale of witnesses and jurors on the question. That such is the legitimate result, we have only to take their own words :—"On the other hand, it was replied, that the resolution stated only a well-known truth, that indulgence in any practice rendered those who indulged in it less able to judge, with clearness and impartiality, touching the propriety of that practice." Of course, we come fairly to the conclusion, that the injuries done to the mind by extreme abstinences disqualify it for a correct judgment on the effects of the practice; or, whatever be the supposed state of the mind, its judgment, by this rule, is vitiated. If it cuts off the drinkers of wine, it also cuts off those who abstain from it.

We have actually heard a cold-water drinker, of high standing in society, say—and he said it gravely, believing it—that he had found the beverage of water so intoxicating, he was obliged to adopt rigid rules of temperance in the use of it, to save himself from injury! This gentleman believed that water was intoxicating! Is his opinion to be respected? It only shows that the enthusiasm of the abstinents, in company with their new

and peculiar sensations, unsettles their judgment; and that, according to the principle of the above resolution, they are not to be heard.

It is true, indeed, the basis of this resolution is couched in terms of cant, and will be appreciated as such—Temperance cant and religious cant—and all to accomplish an unworthy, nefarious design. It is true that it will prove one thing as well as another, inasmuch as it proves nothing. It means to assert that the great body of the community are disqualified by their habits of "intoxication" from all voice on the Temperance question; but it proves also, in the same words, that the opinion of the framers is good for nothing. The design, however, is apparent, that the authors intended to stamp the seal of reprobation and excommunication, henceforth and for ever, on all men who shall any longer presume to taste the beverages which these self-commissioned apostles have prohibited. They have set up a tribunal; they have passed judgment; and they think that judgment will stand. If it should not stand, they have their retreat:—They can say they meant nothing, and appeal to the document as containing nothing more than a truism. It means, in short, just so much, and just so little, as may be convenient for them, either to retain their victims under the full measure of the curse, or to acquit themselves if they do not succeed.

"A mocker?" What is that? Were the author a sermonizer, and addicted to the business of expounding texts, he would say, it means a man so

affected by intoxicating drink as to see two or more objects where there is but one; and this, no doubt, is the simple and true exposition. Or, as one of the debaters on this question, at Saratoga, facetiously remarked, it means "a man lying on his back upon the floor, and holding fast to keep himself from falling upwards;" or, as Davy Crockett would have it—"A man who cannot hit a door with his hat at three times throwing." And with such a one "wine is a mocker." We do not say that a less degree of intoxication is not mockery; but we maintain that this is a fair and true illustration of the Scripture meaning.

To pervert, overstrain, and misapply the word "intoxicating," for the purpose of impeaching character; and then, to pervert Scripture language to make out a sentence of condemnation over the heads of the innocent, argues a heart which we have not in our own feelings to envy.

To show that the author is not without some respectable company in the interpretations he has put upon this resolution, he would here introduce some of the names who were opposed to it in the Convention:—

The Rev. Professor Potter, of Union College, "Expressed his regret that he was unable to acquiesce in the sentiment or language of the resolution. The sentiment expressed amounted to this: that every man who made use of any liquor that could intoxicate, however seldom, however sparing, was in consequence brought under an influence

which disqualified him to judge of all questions in which temperance was concerned. To publish to the world a sentiment like this, he could not but regard as an event most inauspicious to the future progress of the Temperance cause. It was indeed true that sacred writ declared wine to be 'a mocker,' and it also declared that 'new wine' (unfermented) 'taketh away the heart.' If, then, the declarations of Scripture were to be considered as evidence that every one who takes any particle of intoxicating drink is brought under an unhallowed influence, which weakens and blinds his judgment, the same authority must lead us to conclude that every one who uses that species of unfermented wine, which it has by some been proposed to introduce exclusively at the communion-table, is under a like disqualification to judge correctly in the matter of temperance. He deprecated the introduction of such a sentiment. He did not believe that such persons were necessarily disqualified to form a correct judgment as to the use of intoxicating liquor. The Convention was aware that he did not say this to shield his own practice. His friends all knew that he practised total abstinence in the strictest sense of that phrase; but he could not and would not say that every man who used the smallest quantity of intoxicating liquor came so far under the dominion of an attachment to it as to disqualify him from forming a judgment as to the propriety of its use. It had not been unusual, with some friends of total abstinence, to impute all reluctance mani-

fested by any one to pledge himself to that course, to the force of appetite and a secret love of strong drink. Indeed, it had been publicly assumed, that alcohol lay at the bottom of all such reluctance, and secretly operated to blind the mind and mislead the judgment. The proposed resolution would be generally understood as intended to avow this sentiment. Now, in the first place, he did not believe it to be true, that the man who used the least quantity of wine or other fermented liquor was thereby rendered incapable of judging correctly of any argument in favour of total abstinence; nor was it expedient to hold out to the friends of the cause the sentiment, that they ought to begin their efforts at reform by imputing bad influences and bad motives to those whom they wished to persuade. Let it not be supposed that he was afraid to avow any sentiment he held. But it might be very inexpedient to do that which a man was not afraid to do. It was a sign of the times, and a sign well worthy of notice, that the Convention had heard a fear of this measure expressed by Thomas P. Hunt, a gentleman who certainly was not generally thought a coward on the subject of temperance. It was not on that ground that he and those who thought with him objected to this resolution. It was not because the resolution struck at the conscience or intellect of men, that he objected to its adoption. But because, in the present aspect of the Temperance cause, it was not expedient, and was not right, to utter such a sentiment as that expressed by the

resolution. It was a breach of Christian charity. They had no right to say to a Christian brother who was unwilling entirely to relinquish wine, that he was under the power of a love of alcohol; such a spirit was contrary to the Bible. It was unbecoming and most unwise on approaching men, to commence by impeaching their motives. The association went out of its proper province in so doing. Temperance Societies undertook to pronounce on the morality of acts alone. They condemned the act of drinking and the act of selling liquor, but they meddled not with the motives of their fellow-men. To judge of men's motives belonged only to the Omniscient Being. Prof. P. said he had been very sorry to hear remarks made on that floor which seemed to imply that a man could exhibit no moral courage, unless he adopted the principle and practice of total abstinence. *We* have moral courage, though but a small minority. We stand up fearlessly, and deny your moral right to hold any such language as you propose to utter."

The Rev. Dr. Beecher said, "I do not object to the proposition contained in the resolution as being *untrue*, but I would suggest a doubt *whether all the points we wish to carry* would be as well achieved by its adoption as by passing it over," &c.

Even the Rev. Mr. Hunt, the celebrated lecturer on Temperance, was brought to a pause: "To the abstract truth of the proposition contained in the resolution, he was ready to assent; but to the *pro-*

priety of declaring it in the way it had been presented by the committee, he could not assent. There was no necessity for it, and he knew it would have a bad influence. . . . . The Convention ought so to express the truth as not to make it convey a lie. The Apostle Paul, when sitting at the table of his Lord, did use a small portion of wine, but did not thereby injure the powers of his judgment. It was not true that every man who made any the least use of an intoxicating beverage was thereby brought under its power."

The Rev. Mr. Hodgson, of the Methodist Church, New-York, said, "He objected to the resolution as a mere truism, unless it was aimed at those who used wine in any quantity, however small, even at the communion-table; and, if so, it was then very objectionable." Mr. Hodgson himself did not use it anywhere except at the Sacramental Supper.

The Rev. Mr. Cummings, of New-York:—"It is the language of Scripture, 'I, wisdom, dwell with prudence.' And Mr. Cummings was bold to affirm, that the Temperance reformation had now its enemies among those who had been its fast friends but for ultraism—for excess—for going beyond the bounds of sound discretion. As for himself, he went in practice the whole length of the most rigid abstinence. Like many others, he had begun with abjuring ardent spirits. He now renounced the whole, and many a heart and many a hand should they have wholly with them if they would but abstain from denunciation. When the

resolution declared strong drink to be 'a mocker,' it stated nothing more than what all present believed; but when it went to insinuate that all who made any use of wine or other fermented liquor, came so under its influence that they could not judge of the advantages and obligations of temperance—it advanced a proposition to which many could not assent, and one which, as he believed, would, if adopted, make enemies of those who were now friends.

"I am against the resolution; and I desire that it shall be known that I am against it. Gentlemen may call for the question, but I shall call for the yeas and nays. I cannot, with a Bible in my hand, which tells me that my Saviour took wine, come to the conclusion that the man who makes use of what God allows is thereby disqualified to come to a right decision on a plain question of morals. We have now arrived at a critical point; and though gentlemen may scoff and sneer, and may affect to disregard the influence and age of a certain class in the community, let me tell them that is a class not to be scorned; that their weight in this land is not light; that we are bound not to lay a stumbling-block before our brother, and are commanded not to let our good be evil spoken of;—yet, pass this resolution, and it will be. I stake my reputation, that men who occupy a high station in society, men whose names tell on the ear of the American public, will hold up this resolution in your face, and ask whether you wish them to join

a society which has undertaken to raise a standard of morals that shall put to the blush the practice of the Redeemer himself? In such an attempt I will have neither part nor lot."

Rev. Dr. McMasters:—"The true question is, whether a resolution shall go out from this body *reprobating* the character of all those who make use of wine temperately? There is avowed on both sides a disapprobation of the use of all intoxicating liquor as a common beverage. You may pass this resolution; you may attempt to fix a brand on all who make any use whatever of wine, or cider, or beer. But what will be the effect, especially on the great body of Christians throughout this land? It will drive from your ranks a body of men who are in practice as temperate as any of those who would vote for this resolution. You tell me that a resolution taking in the question of entire abstinence is *now* necessary; and that it will everywhere prevail at a day not far distant. It *may be* so; but that day has not yet come, except so far as recommendation and example are concerned. I say, let us be content with laying down sound principles as a foundation, and let the details be brought out by practice. In this manner we shall carry forward our Temperance reform in a solid and rational manner. But not by voting extreme resolutions, and excluding from our ranks numbers of those who properly belong to us. You may send out your resolution, and put your ban upon every man who ventures to take a glass of

wine, and thereby put all such men from under your influence; but remember, that he who attempts to be a reformer must, in order to succeed, have intercourse with the people, and thus get a hold upon their minds. But a resolution like this divides you from the community; and not only so, it produces division in your ranks, and occasions a division in action among those who ought to be as one. And, rely upon it, by thus pressing to extremes, more time will be consumed by the true friends of Temperance, in opposing each other, than in carrying forward the general cause.

"Permit me to make another remark. You will find that the great body of good men in every country, the great majority of the Church of God, whatever curious interpretations may be given of certain parts of Scripture, will read their Bibles for themselves, and exercise their own understanding upon its meaning. Now, the Spirit of God has said, that 'wine is a mocker,' and there is no doubt whatever that it is so when unduly used. Yet you will find that there are thousands and tens of thousands who never can be brought to put the ban of reprobation upon that high-priest who met Abraham with bread and with *wine* also. They will believe that the 104th Psalm was dictated by the Divine spirit, and there they will read that we are called upon to bless God for 'wine, which maketh glad the heart of man,' and you will never find that the great body of Christian men are prepared to say that the man after God's own heart, when

speaking under the inspiration of God's spirit, rendered thanks to God for what was in itself evil, and could not even be touched without sin. The spirit of God speaks of wine which 'makes glad the heart.' It does not say 'which intoxicates men.' It has been said, indeed, that all exhilaration is intoxication, but to this I can never agree: for a man cannot drink tea, or coffee, or even eat bread, when greatly exhausted, without being exhilarated by it. Reference has been made to the language of Solomon: 'It is not good, O Lemuel, it is not good for kings to drink wine, nor for princes strong drink.' But what is added: 'Give strong drink to him that is ready to perish, and wine to such as are heavy of heart.' But why? For what purpose—if all exhilaration is drunkenness, and wine is poison? If it be such an evil, why did our Saviour work a miracle to make use of it? However this reference may be hissed down, it remains true that the Son of Man came eating and drinking; and that he drank wine is probable, from the fact that his practice was made a reproach, insomuch that he was called a 'wine-bibber.' According to the arguments that have been adduced on this floor, on which side would some of these gentlemen have been found in the Saviour's day? With those who said, 'he hath done all things well,' or with those who reviled him as a 'wine-bibber, and a friend of publicans and sinners?' I do say that the arguments that have here been used by some of those who have spoken, go

directly to impeach the moral character of the Redeemer of the world. I vote against this resolution. Nor do I take this ground because I either use wine or love it as a common beverage, for I do neither; but because the doctrine maintained is against the spirit of the Bible, and involves an impeachment of the character of the Redeemer of men."

Mr. Slade, of Vermont:—"If the Convention meant that a man was rendered incapable of forming a correct judgment, as soon as he became actually intoxicated, then let them say so plainly. But that was not the meaning of the committee; they meant to say, as he understood them, that all men who drink any intoxicating liquor, in however small quantity, were thereby rendered incapable of a sound exercise of their judgment on questions in which such use was involved. If they ever sipped half a glass of wine, they committed themselves, and, on the ground of that committal, were disabled from passing judgment. Now, did the Convention mean to affirm both these propositions? or did they affirm one only? If they meant both, then it was worse and worse.

"The great force of my objection to the resolution is this: the impeachment it contains is made to stand out in too bold relief. I am willing to say that the use of ardent spirits impairs the judgment of men—that is one thing. But to pass a resolution, the burden of which is to denounce all who make any use of wine, as incapable of judging

fairly on the subject of the Temperance reformation, is quite another thing. I fear the prominence that is given to this denunciation."

And yet this resolution was passed, under such slight alterations as appear in the second form, which we have before given. The amendments, reluctantly forced upon the authors of it, neither touch nor modify the principle. Substitutes were offered by the Rev. Professor Potter and others; but they were rejected. We have not been able to see that the explanations and reasonings of the advocates of this measure relieve the picture we have given of it a whit.

"It has been asked," said one of its advocates, "if we mean to say that a man who drinks wine *once a year* is incapacitated through the rest of that year to judge on the subject of Temperance? I answer, yes: we do mean that. We mean to say, that his judgment is injured, not only when he is drunk, but when he is not drunk."—"*Not only when he is drunk.*" Here, we humbly think, is the nakedness of the resolution. It makes no distinction of time or degree. A man is a drunkard who drinks half a glass, or a teaspoonful of wine, or any less quantity, once a year! Of course, every communicant of the Lord's table is a drunkard! And every time he approaches that table he commits the crime of drunkenness! The apostles do not escape! Christ himself stands convicted!! "Even admitting it to be true," said another gentleman, "that the Lord did establish the use of

alcoholic wine at his table, our Saviour did many things which we ought not to do!" Ah? And then they mean to annul this ordinance? Doubtless. It was repeatedly said by the advocates of this resolution during the debate, "We are *prepared* for that question!"

We will now proceed to a notice of the other resolution proposed to be considered:—

"*Resolved*, that as the [prevailing] use of intoxicating liquor as a beverage tends not only to produce and aggravate diseases," &c.*

This is a resolution of the same general character with the one we have just noticed; but in many respects more extraordinary. It has a swelling, ponderous, magniloquent, immeasurable middle, tapering off, in *appearance*, to nothing at each end. Neither is it simply a bladder, or bag of wind; but it is stuffed and crammed with all manner of evil, which this poor mortal state and earth are heirs to. Nothing that is bad in this world or the next—bad physical and bad moral—that man has ever done, experienced, known, or heard of, which is not gathered and packed in this resolution: Class 1. All manner of disease, hereditary and others, deteriorating the human race. 2. Insanity in its various forms. 3. Waste of property, and destruction of social and domestic happiness. 4. Destruction of the moral sense. 5. Mind, affections, and all

* See page 225.

the powers of man debased. 6. Pauperism and crime. 7. Destruction of civil liberty. 8. Irreligion, ignorance, intellectual and moral debasement, and loss of temporal and eternal happiness. 9. Life shortened and souls ruined.

Though this classification of evils might have been better done, it must be admitted they exist. But whence came they?—is the question. By alcohol, certainly. And how are we to be rid of them? By letting alcohol alone. Alcohol is the kill-all, and abstinence is the cure-all. There is no evil which did not come by it, and none which may not be removed by abstaining from it. Quackery? O no. It is philosophy—science—fact.

But what a modest preface to such a chapter! What an unsuitable warning to the opening of this budget of evil—of this Pandora's box! "Resolved, that as the [prevailing] use of intoxicating liquor tends," &c. The word "prevailing" was not in the original draught, but was forced in by the impertinent interference of some members of the Convention, to encumber and vitiate this document. It has no meaning in the place, and was not intended to be there. The object of the framers was to say, simply and without qualification—The use of intoxicating liquor, that is, of wine, or of any of the milder alcoholic beverages, in whatever degree, and in any case, "tends" to produce all these evils, and is responsible for them. It was not any particular, or any "prevailing" use, but any use whatever and by whomsoever, that was designed to be indicated

here. Of course, the use of wine by Christ in the institution of the Sacramental Supper had in it the germe of these results—"tended" this way; and that is most formidable of all, because, with such high authority to sustain it, it is most difficult to be cured. So also the use of wine in this ordinance by the first Christians, who were accustomed to observe it every time they met together, every day when they happened to be assembled so often, must have been most prolific of this mischief. And although, so far as we have observed, it does not appear to have been thought of, we may yet expect the argument in proof from the actual developments of Scripture history: "One is hungry, and another is *drunken*"—at the Lord's table, as charged upon the Corinthian Christians by Paul. Such lecturers may, however, be stumbled a little at the next sentence, which exclaims in expostulation: "What? Have ye not houses to eat and to *drink* in?" Which would seem to imply, that, although it might be proper to drink wine more freely at home, it was very improper to make such a free use of it in their public and religious assemblies, where it was authorized and appointed merely as a sacramental symbol. These abuses would seem to prove, at least, that intoxicating wines were appropriated to the uses of that ordinance in the apostolic days.

Doubtless, the design of the framers of this resolution was to establish a connexion, by the subtleties of their own mode of argument, between the

most temperate use of wine and the stupendous evils, the specification of which they have seen fit to imbody in the document, and to make such a use of wine responsible for these results. They do not say, the excesses of mankind in "the use of intoxicating liquor" have produced these effects; but "the use," &c. But this statement would have been the exact truth, except, perhaps, they should have allowed, that *all* the evil in the world is not owing to this cause; and consequently, it would appear, that even in this form the statement would have been an extravagant one.

But, as in the former resolution, they were resolved to convict those who use wine, &c., in any degree, of an utter incapacity to sit as fellow-jurors with themselves on "the propriety of such use," and seal them up for ever as outlaws—as doomed culprits, who have no common rights in society—so, in the present instance, they have deemed it warrantable to advance one step farther—to make a stride *toto cælo*—and fasten upon this crime, which thus disqualified the judgment, the responsibility of all the several and known evils of the human state. And how? It "tends," &c.

But is the temperate use of wine, &c., or even the "prevailing" use, among the respectable portions of the community, known to produce these results, or any *one* of them? If not, then is it a libel—a gross slander. Does it "tend" to produce them? So does the earth "tend" to produce grapes; and grapes in the press "tend" to produce wine, if the

juice be bottled; and wine drunk "tends" to "make glad the heart of man." The creative energies of God "tended" to produce this magnificent and glorious creation; and the moral economy set up in it "tended," in company with other results, to the introduction of moral evil, &c. So, at least, say the theologians; and so, in fact, it has come to pass. Is the Creator, therefore, responsible for the existence of moral evil? The passions of man in his fallen state "tend" to produce vice; and shall not these elements of his moral being be exercised—employed? Is there no ground on which his virtue is to be proved? The temptations of society "tend" to crime; and shall the social state be dissolved? The appetite for food "tends" to excess—to gluttony; and shall not a man eat? Differences of opinion "tend" to disputes; disputes to passion; passion to war; and war desolates the earth. Shall the right of opinion, therefore, be surrendered? Man "tends" to reproduce his species; and the race "tend" to behave badly. Is it wrong to "multiply and replenish the earth?"

Since these gentlemen are fond of subtleties, they must excuse us for keeping them company. This doctrine of "tendencies," when it comes to be analyzed and followed up, seems to lead us into dubious regions. Man must live, unless, peradventure, "tending" to evil, it shall be thought best to cut off the race at once. He must act, unless, for the same reason, some Almighty power

shall paralyze these "tendencies." He must eat and drink; and there are "tendencies" in all this to get harm and do harm. There must be a basis, a field, and a proof of virtue; but this cannot be without "tendencies" to vice.

It is important, indeed, with such natures as ours, and in this world of temptation, that we should be regulated by wholesome laws and proper authority; and so in any case. And we know of no better law than the Bible; and of no higher authority than its author. And it happens that one of the two appointed symbols of the great atoning sacrifice for the sins of men is *wine*—even *wine*. And the command is:—"All ye drink of it."—"For as often as ye eat this bread, and *drink this cup*, ye do show the Lord's death till he come." This is, indeed, a grave and solemn reference; nevertheless, it is to the point. And he who shall dare to say that it "tends" to the results specified and enumerated in the resolution now under consideration, as being responsible for them, does indeed decide the question, and the very question at issue in this discussion, so far as his right and authority can go; but his temerity can only be measured by his fanaticism! May his sin be forgiven.

Suppose we turn the tables, and say:—Gentlemen, this course of yours "*tends*" to diminish your influence. The public will see through it. It "tends" to bring the Temperance reformation into contempt, and to disappoint all its aims; it "tends"

to destroy public confidence in all reforming institutions and efforts. It "tends" to divide you from the community, and to set the latter against you. The "tendency" of such transactions is to make the very name of the Temperance Society loathsome, to provoke those who drink wine to drink more, within the circle of your influence to increase the number of secret drinkers, and in that way to multiply the number of drunkards in the land; to throw back the cause, till this disgust shall pass off; and to cast insurmountable obstacles in the way of its revival. In a word:—This extravagance, this unfairness, these subtleties of argument and sophistries of reasoning—this forced attempt to establish the connexion of cause and effect between practices of the most respectable portions of the community, of its best and most influential members, of the great majority of Christians, of the apostles, of Christ himself, and the worst evils and crimes to be found in the world; —yes, rely upon it, gentlemen, the "tendency" of these measures is to fasten upon you all the responsibility which you charge upon more innocent persons. Ye who have undertaken to determine the philosophy of "tendencies," will do well to look to the "tendency" of your own doings. "I stake my reputation upon it," said Mr. Cummings, in application to the other resolution, and it is no less applicable to this, "that men who occupy high stations in society, men whose names tell on the ear of the American public, will hold up this

resolution in your face, and ask whether you wish them to join such a society?" And such, we think, must be the general feeling. Thus intemperance must inevitably be increased; the bands that had been drawn with such force will be snapped asunder; and men will revel in their cups till a more reasonable and more salutary control can be brought over them. To shock the common sense of the community by measures of this kind is doing infinite mischief, and involves a responsibility for which the authors ought to be concerned. Do they think that men will not feel obliged to respect themselves?—and the more so, the more they are crowded with false and slanderous charges?—and that they will not hold the aggressors in profound and utter contempt?

The leading advocates of this resolution before the Convention rested their argument principally upon the assumption that alcohol is a poison. The definitions of poison are so various in different hands, that we have not thought it worth while, while engaged in the treatment of this subject in a former part of this volume, to deny, that alcohol is one of the class; but we have there stated, what cannot be gainsaid, that poisons are all about us and in us; that we are constantly in contact with them; that they cannot be avoided; that they may be, and are, useful—indispensable to life and health. Two of the ingredients of atmospheric air, carbonic acid gas and nitrogen, are deadly poisons; and yet

we could not live without them, as diffused in their latent and combined state. Some of the more palpable poisons, arsenic, &c., are prescribed as medicines. Dr. Mussey states, that some farmers in Germany are in the habit of using arsenic, to the amount of two grains a day; and they aver they cannot dispense with it. Probably it is injurious, like the habitual use of opium. The cry of poison in this case is manifestly *argumentum ad captandum vulgus*. Nothing is more innocent than poison, if rightly used; it is, in fact, one of the most important and useful agents, not only in chymistry, but in application to animal being.

That uneducated and ignorant men should cry—"poison"—is quite excusable; but that Dr. Mussey should join in it, and rest his argument against alcohol principally, if not solely, on that ground—is not in his favour, as a scientific man, to say the least. We have absolutely been amazed at the structure, drift, and substance of his argument before the Convention. It was "poison! poison! poison!"—and little else. Dr. Beaumont's observations on the action of a stomach, that lay open to the eye, in a living subject, might or might not be pertinent. That would depend on two contingencies; first, whether the exposure of the internal surface, in such a case, to common air, would affect the experiment; and next, on the amount of alcohol taken into the system. That a quart of gin, taken at a draught, should show itself in the secretions and circulating fluids, and be injurious, is surely no

more to be disputed, than that a man—who ate the supper of four others, and a nine pound ham at the end of it; or another, who disposed of eight rabbits at a dinner; or the one who devoured a whole sheep at a meal; or the fourth, who is said to have eaten a hog at one sitting, as narrated by Dr. Mussey in his popular lectures—should be the worse for it. We do not mean to intimate that Dr. Mussey fully confides in these statements, as veritable history; but only that he has seen fit to introduce such stories in his lectures, as reputed instances of excess in eating. *Admitting the facts*, nobody will contest the doctor's conclusions. But what are *excesses* and their results to the point?

Dr. Mussey says, a certain quantity of the right kind of oil will assist the operations of a watch; but add to it the oil of vitriol, and the metals will be corroded. Ergo: Alcohol is injurious to the animal economy! Or, if *we* may state a case: Lying is an immorality; therefore, drunkenness ought to be avoided. This last statement none will dispute, however we may not be able to see how it *follows* as a *conclusion*.

Is Dr. Mussey a practitioner in medicine and surgery, a public lecturer in one or both, an observer of the functions of animal life, and of the repelling, self-defending, and self-restoring power of animal vitality against the assaults of hostile agencies; and yet will he say, that the corroding power of the oil of vitriol on certain inert substances is a fair illustration of the effects of alcohol, or

any other poison, on the animal economy? Verily, we did not think so. And yet the doctor says: "The individual who dies of delirium tremens is not killed by the last dose of liquor, but by the habit of taking liquor. [True. But mark the following:] Each draught that he ever swallowed did something towards producing the catastrophe. Every drop he ever tasted had its share towards the issue; and though we may not be able exactly to measure or to show the effect of each, yet the reasoning is not the less conclusive on that account. . . . . If much poison does much harm, a little poison does a little harm." If the doctor means to say, that the catastrophe stated is the result of the combined influence of all the historical stages of the habit of using alcohol, on the moral and physical constitution of the subject, we concur with him; at least, we will not contest the point. But, admitting for the present, what the doctor claims, that the least possible quantity of alcohol is hostile to animal nature, he has made no allowance, as a physiologist, for the repelling, self-defending, and self-restoring tendencies of animal vitality against the first invasions of a foe; but he reasons as if the human frame were the watch, and alcohol the oil of vitriol; and as if the first touch of alcohol on the animal economy will fasten its imprint as indelibly as the chymical effect of the vitriol on the metal; which, it must be seen, is a fallacy. The doctor knows very well that the animal constitution of a drunkard has in it a self-restoring power,

if he will only abstain from alcohol altogether; whereas the effects of the vitriol on the watch must remain, so far as they have progressed. Much more will a man, otherwise healthy, recover from the effects of excess in the use of alcohol, if his reformation is early; and much more still, admitting alcohol is injurious in all and any degrees, if he breaks off before any serious and very apparent invasions have been made on his constitution. The man who dies of delirium tremens may possibly have reformed a plural number of times in the earlier and less intemperate stages of his drinking history, and as many times he may have had his constitution restored to perfect soundness, so far as the effects of this supposed poison are concerned. It is not true, therefore, as a matter of course, in the sense in which we suppose the doctor means to be understood, that "each draught he ever swallowed, and each drop he ever tasted, had something to do in producing the catastrophe;" and that, "if much poison does much harm, a little poison does a little harm."

Either this argument is a philosophical one, or it is not. The doctor professes to build on philosophy. Why then should we speak as if we were aiming solely *ad captandum vulgus?* Why not put the case on its own proper ground—where common sense, and common observation, must put it—first, and middle, and last—viz., that the evil of using alcoholic drinks consists in the danger of acquiring an ungovernable appetite for them; and

of being ultimately doomed to the consequences which are known to result from the unrestrained indulgence of this propensity? And facts will show that there is argument enough in this to answer all the purposes, and to awaken all the zeal, and all the union of effort among the well-wishers of men, that may be required in the cause of a public reformation. It will be as easy to carry the point of total abstinence from all intoxicating beverages on this ground as on any other, if it can be shown to be necessary for public good; and more so, because it is the only true ground.

Dr. Reese said, in the progress of the debate on this resolution:—"There is no species of ultraism more to be deplored, or more treacherous and fallacious, than that which maintains that the taking of any quantity of alcohol, however diluted or compounded, is *malum in se*—is necessarily and in all circumstances a moral offence; especially when this doctrine is looked at in connexion with moral science. It is greatly to be deprecated, that Temperance societies should attempt to exercise prerogatives which do not belong to them. I conceive that this Convention is wholly unauthorized to give any decision on such questions. They are questions in moral science, and do not pertain to us. We are not here to pass resolutions of denunciation, and send them forth as so many popish bulls, or ecclesiastical anathemas, denouncing our fellow-men—men as upright and as conscientious

as ourselves..... It has here been distinctly avowed, that the taking of one drop of alcohol in any form is not only taking so much poison, but is in all cases a sin. And then we were entertained with a sapient comment on the conduct of our Saviour; and it was asked, with airs of triumph, whether it could be possible that Jesus Christ ever consecrated such a substance as alcohol to be the memorial of his death? And the allusion was carried fully out, and a blow openly struck at the use of wine in the Lord's Supper..... Should this Convention suffer the resolutions that have already been passed to go out to the world, and take no steps to avoid their being misunderstood [or rather, rightly understood]..... then, sir, the axe is laid at the root of the Temperance cause, and the Church of God and the ministers of his Gospel, throughout the length and breadth of this land, will be constrained, by their duty to God and their regard for his laws, to abandon you, and to raise their voice against what they believe to be a pernicious heresy, reflecting on Jesus Christ, and tending to subvert his ordinances."

The Rev. Professor Potter delivered the following sentiments on this resolution:—"I wish in a few words to call the attention of this Convention to the extent to which they are about to commit themselves. So far as the expediency of the use of alcohol is involved, there is no difference of opinion: but, so far as the abstract question, whether the use at all of any thing which contains it,

at any period of the world, and under any circumstances, may be right, there is a great and radical difference. This resolution commits us to a declaration, that all use of any thing which contains alcohol is in itself wrong. That is the substance of the resolution, according to the explanation which has been given by the distinguished gentleman from Dartmouth College (Professor Mussey). As alcohol is a poison, it must therefore injure the human system in every form of chymical combination, however small the quantity may be, and how seldom soever it may be received. Now, if a man holds all use of wine in our own houses to be morally wrong, because wine is a poison, then he holds that any use of wine at the table of the Lord must be morally wrong, because it is as poisonous there as anywhere else. And the man who takes one drop of wine from God's table, goes so far towards poisoning himself; that is, he violates the law of God in the very act by which he obeys the last injunction of his Saviour. He cannot keep Christ's dying command without violating a primary law of his being; and so the very article which Jesus Christ selected and consecrated as the perpetual symbol in his church of the blessings of salvation, was an article which contained POISON! The Son of God selected, as the symbol of his own shed blood, and gave to be received and drunk by his disciples—*poison!* I think that resolution contains this doctrine. It is a doctrine I do not believe. I never can believe that of

which Jesus Christ said, 'Drink ye all of it,' has the least tendency to perpetuate evil. I do not believe that the use of it, as it is often used, and has long been used by many, has in itself a tendency to produce and perpetuate evil. But I do believe, that in our country and in this age, the use of all stimulants has become so excessive, that, to break up the use of them, it becomes all friends of humanity to agree in the practice of total abstinence. The argument on the other side involves a great and radical fallacy. I say this with extreme deference for the highly respectable gentlemen who have advanced it, but still I must speak what I believe. It does not follow that because a substance in its undiluted state is poison, that therefore in a state much diluted it is still a poison. On that principle the atmosphere of this room must be a deadly poison, for we all know that, by the breathing of so many persons, some portion of poison has been mixed with the air we are all breathing. By the same process of reasoning, I could demonstrate that it is wrong for ten men ever to assemble in one apartment, and it must be wrong in the extreme for five hundred men ever to assemble in a Temperance Convention. Is there not carbonic acid gas present in this apartment? Does not every respiration from the lungs of every individual present pour out more or less of that gas? And is not this a fundamental law of nature? And are we not, then, according to the reasoning, by coming together in this place, viola-

ting a primary law of our being? Yet will any man of common sense attempt to argue, that human beings should never assemble together? Would you place heralds at the doors of this house, publishing a *caveat* to all who pass by, warning them not to enter this assembly, because the very first thing they will encounter is a gaseous poison? Reasoning which brings us to such a conclusion cannot be sound. I admit that it is not necessary, nor expedient, to use any intoxicating liquor as a beverage; and I will go further, and admit that, *under existing circumstances*, it is not right so to use it. But I wish to show that the moral evil grows out of the *abuse*, not out of the *use* of it; inasmuch as its use has been sanctioned by the sacred and ever-to-be-revered example of our Divine Redeemer.

"My object in speaking at all was to call the attention of the Convention to the true import of a resolution they seemed about to pass. I thought it intended to convey more than had yet reached the house. This must be evident to any who will examine it with calmness. It proposes that this Convention shall assert certain abstract positions in relation to morals—that we shall denounce the use of all alcoholic beverages under any possible circumstances. After a long preamble, it declares that the use of alcohol, under any circumstances, is, in the opinion of this convention, "not right;" by which it means, as I suppose, that all such use is wrong. The Convention therefore are to issue

it to the world as their decision, that all use of alcoholic liquor, under any circumstances, is wrong. If the proposition had been confined to our own country and our own time, I might have been more ready to agree to it; but its aspect is both reflex and prospective. And it does impliedly reflect on the conduct of Christ in consecrating this fell *poison* as the chosen symbol of his own dying love. The Convention, I am sure, will not believe that I wish to advocate the use of any intoxicating liquors, or that I am opposed to the principle of Total Abstinence. On the contrary, I am anxious for the adoption of that principle, but I oppose this resolution because, when the arguments used in support of any cause are in themselves fallacious, they only react on the cause they were intended to promote. By a well-known principle of association, men will always link these weak arguments with the cause itself; and if they are baseless, and will not bear examination, the weakness of the argument is particularly transferred to the cause. I do maintain that the argument contained by implication in the resolution, and more distinctly set forth by Dr. Mussey, does reflect on the conduct of our Saviour. My friend from Schenectady did indeed appeal with great confidence, especially to the divines around him, to say whether it could be possible that the Son of God had consecrated so fell a compound as the emblem of his own atonement? Now I say that there is a fallacy in this whole argument. What does the argument amount

to? It is this: alcohol is a poison. All intoxicating liquors contain alcohol, therefore all intoxicating liquors are poisonous. And, to carry it out, it has been common to employ alcohol as a common designation for all intoxicating liquors. Now there is no dispute at all whether alcohol is a poison—there is no dispute as to its character, whether in a small or large quantity. My argument was not directed to that point. I do not dispute that a single drop is as much poison as a large quantity is; but, I ask, if that single drop be mingled with a hogshead of water, is the whole mixture a poison? I repeat the question. When one drop of alcohol is infused into a hogshead of water, is the entire mixture poison? It contains poison, I admit, just on the same principle as the atmosphere of this room contains poison; but so does the atmosphere of all nature. If you take a cubic foot of air from the top of the loftiest mountain, it will contain more or less of that which is noxious. But, I ask, is it therefore poisonous air, unfit to breathe? Does a man who breathes it sin against the principles of his being? The argument against wine is the argument against the atmosphere. Let us put them both in the form of a syllogism:

"Alcohol is a poison:

"Wine contains alcohol:

"Therefore wine is a poison.

"Carbonic acid gas is a poison:

"The atmosphere contains carbonic acid gas:

"Therefore the atmosphere is a poison.

"Gentlemen have mistaken the gist of the argument. They forget the grand fundamental difference between the qualities of a compound and the qualities of the elements of which it is composed. And they assert that the compound must have all the qualities which belong to its elements, which is by no means true. Indulge me in one more illustration. I will take nitrogen. I will put an animal under a receiver, and cause him to breathe pure nitrogen. What is the effect? He expires in convulsions. Nitrogen, then, is a poison; but nitrogen is one of the component ingredients of the atmosphere, and, when duly mixed with a proportion of oxygen, it is the very element of life. That which, when alone, is a principle of death, when compounded, is the vital element. You see, then, that the character of a substance may be entirely changed by its relation to some other ingredient. Alone it may be a poison, yet in combination it may be the very support of existence. Now I adduce this argument, not with a view to recommend the use of intoxicating liquor in our country—far from it; but as an argument to show that, by adopting such a proposition, you will place a stumbling-block before reflecting minds, and many will attach to the cause you advocate the false argument by which you seek to sustain it. And why should we resort to weak arguments when there are irrefutable arguments on which we may rely—arguments which address themselves to a sound understanding, which present their appeal to the conscience and the heart,

and which will carry us triumphantly to the goal we seek? If the resolution placed the claims of total abstinence on grounds which commend themselves to the common sense of the world, I would go for it.

"There are one or two other popular fallacies on this subject, but I pass them for the present. One word to the gentleman who in his kindness apprehended that there might perhaps be some drunkard present who was wavering in his decision, and whom I might determine to the side of inebriety. The suggestion, I admit, is most painful, and it has often kept me silent when I wished to raise my voice against what I was convinced was wrong. But no success can be permanent except that which is founded on truth. I know indeed that a measure is to be judged by its fruits; but not merely by its immediate fruits. I am aware that this 'go-ahead' system, no matter how fast or how far, has, in some cases, had good fruits, but we know not how much there has been that is bad. There is a fruit which is fair to the eye and ashes on the lips. We need time and experience to arrive at a just conclusion, and I doubt not that some of those now around me, and who are warm advocates of the 'go-ahead' principle, may, on a riper experience, discover in the long run that they have done not a little harm.

"Now what are we who hold this opinion to do? We see measures warmly pressed which we believe calculated to injure, if not arrest, the

progress of the Temperance reform. Must we for ever shut our lips, lest some unhappy drunkard may misconstrue what we say? Oh, sir, let us cling to the truth. Let us pursue an honest, straight-forward policy. Be assured of it, we never shall triumph on any other ground. But, if otherwise, if indeed a hurricane is destined to sweep over the land, and if measures which have nothing to recommend them but that they 'go ahead'—measures which go ahead of the Bible and of truth—are to become the order of the day, though I may be compelled to retire from all fellowship with such enterprises, I shall at least enjoy this consolation, that, as long as I live, I shall press the principles and practice of total abstinence on the hearts of the young men who may be committed to my charge. The very last duty I performed before I came here was to call around me a young band just about to enter upon the world, and conjure them to abandon the intoxicating cup. And as long as my station shall secure to me any influence over the minds of such young men, my voice shall be raised in behalf of the Temperance cause. Think not that I oppose this resolution because I am a laggard in that cause, or tremble at the thought of carrying out my principles into practice. No, sir, I act under no such impulses. I oppose it because my heart trembles for the ark of my God. I oppose it because I see couched under that resolution an incipient attack on one of the institutions of the Christian Church. I know

it does not openly appear, but its seeds are there. Before I can consistently put my hand to such a resolution, I must be satisfied, on clear and sufficient evidence, that that article which Christ consecrated at the eucharistical table, in that upper chamber where he enjoyed the last supper with his disciples, did not contain one drop of alcohol. Till I have this proved to me, I will not brand the cup which my Lord has placed on the communion-board as a cup of *poison*. I will not, as a minister of Jesus Christ, say to his flock, as I place that cup upon his table, or commend it to their hands, Remember, this is a cup of *poison;* beware how you taste too much or too often. Take care how you do as the primitive Christians did, who partook of the communion-feast every Sabbath, and some of them every day. Beware, there is *poison* in it! True, it is the emblem of that blood which purchased the world's redemption; but the emblem which Christ selected, and which he ordained to be set upon his table through all coming generations, is *poison;* beware how you handle it!"

It is proper to remark, that Professor Potter moved the introduction of the word "prevailing" before "use," which was adopted; and that he voted for the resolution in that form. However this form may be more satisfactory to those who, like Professor Potter, go for total abstinence on the ground of expediency, it still lies with all its denunciatory force against a numerous and most respectable body in the community, who think it

right to use wine and other mild alcoholic beverages. But it is the *design* of the framers of this resolution against which our strictures are directed. And it is still maintained by the Temperance Recorder for September:—"It will be perceived, that the Convention have *fully* recognised the principle of total abstinence from all intoxicating drinks *on the ground of* MORAL *obligation*." They conceive, then, that they have carried their purpose, and boldly publish the decree.

"It is not right," say this Convention, to use wine, or ever so little of it, even in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper; for that is the bearing and the end. So it is understood, nor has it been disclaimed. It has even been indirectly and by implication confessed. It is marvellous that two such extremes should meet, viz., the Papist doctrine of transubstantiation, and the modern Protestant doctrine of abstinence: that, with the Papist, salvation or perdition turned on *partaking* or *not* partaking; and that, with the Temperance reformer, the same alternatives, or, at least, doing right and doing wrong, are based on a reversion of the rule.

"Here we trace the first footmarks of clerical encroachment. The administration of the sacraments was the inviolable prerogative of the priests; and those symbols (sacramental), rather than the great principles they hold forth, were insisted upon as of vital energy. It was upon *touching*, *tasting*, *handling* the material elements, or upon *being* duly touched and handled by the dispensers of the 'mys-

teries,' that eternal life depended. *Not* to be washed (baptized) in the laver of regeneration, *not* to eat of the Divine flesh, *not* to drink the blood, *not* to be anointed with the oil of remission—was to perish everlastingly. Salvation and perdition turned, not upon the condition of the heart in God's sight, but upon having a share of the consecrated fluid or solid matter which the priest might bestow or refuse."*

And if this law was indeed "the first footmark of clerical encroachment" on Christian liberty, God grant that the decrees of the Temperance Convention at Saratoga may be the last. As we find them in the opposite extreme, we have some reason to hope they are. As was said by the authority above quoted, to the same point, "The maturing of spiritual despotism wants little more of means and instruments than it finds in this substitution of superstition and ceremony for vital truth," so may we say in reference to this modern movement of the same kind, which has undertaken to reduce to *nothing* that ordinance, which, at so early a period of the Church, and for so long a time, was made *the every thing*—that *this* is the consummation of what *that* was the beginning. For how is it possible to go any farther? The circle is complete; the world has come round again; and "spiritual despotism" has arrived at the point whence it set out—having exhausted all possible materials, that could be

* Spiritual Despotism.

hunted up in the heights above or in the depths beneath—in heaven, or earth, or hell.

At the ninth annual meeting of the American Temperance Society, August 5, 1836, the chief secretary observed, "That the great object of the Society had been, by the universal diffusion of information, together with the power of argument and persuasion, to exert such a moral influence upon society that intemperance should cease from among men. To this good end three things were needful. One of these was, that the operations of the society should be permanent: with which view a few gentlemen had united to raise a small fund to be appropriated to its use, but on that express condition. The next thing was the collecting of authentic facts, with regard to the influence of intoxicating liquor; and in this labour the society had been occupied for the last ten years, during which time they had had from one to six and seven agents constantly employed. *Their object had been to get facts in a sufficient number and variety to produce, universally, the entire conviction among men of sound mind, that either to use, or to furnish for the use of others, intoxicating drink of any description, is not right, because such drink is not useful to men.* The third object still remained to be done, viz., the universal diffusion of the facts which had been collected. For this end they had been imbodied in a volume of 450 pages, which would contain at its close the report, a part of

which had just been read. The aim and wish of the society was to put one copy of this collection of facts into the hands of every preacher of the Gospel, every teacher of youth, and of every legislator and statesman, in every country of the world."

We have then, here, a distinct and official confession from the chief agent of this society, undisguised, that "their *object* had been" from the beginning, nine years ago, with "from one to six or seven agents constantly employed, to get facts in a sufficient number and variety to produce universally the entire conviction among men of sound mind, that *either to use, or to furnish* for the use of others, intoxicating drink of *any* description, *is not right*," &c. And these facts are now announced in a volume of 450 pages, with the design of "putting a copy into the hands of every preacher of the Gospel, every teacher of youth, and of every legislator and statesman, in every country of the world."

It would appear, then, by this confession, that the decision was made *before* the investigation was commenced, viz., "*It is not right;*" and that the *object* of the nine years' labour has been to *make out a story* to sustain that decision—not, like Lord Bacon, to base the decision on the story—a story fairly told. This object *being attained*, the decision, made nine years ago, is formally and solemnly announced to the world in a series of resolutions passed in General Convention of 1836, which justly surprised and startled those honest minds that were present, who had not been in the secret,

and drew forth from them such lucid and eloquent remonstrances as are imbodied in the specimens we have copied.

Having given our opinion at large in a former chapter as to the extravagant statements, misrepresentation and colouring of facts, and false theories, by which the Temperance reformation in this country has been carried on, it is not required of us in this place to repeat those observations. But we did not then expect to have the key, or explanation, furnished us from such high authority, before we should have finished writing these pages. The Temperance doings at Saratoga for 1836 are, perhaps, among the most remarkable developments of our history as a community. And it is a somewhat remarkable coincidence, that they should be such a perfect confirmation of the doctrine of these pages, and transpire at a moment to put their seal upon the whole.

As an instance of the character of the *facts* collected by the labours of this society, we have it emblazoned in the second resolution of the Convention, "That the progress which has been effected, wherever suitable efforts have been made, during the past year, *especially in foreign countries*, affords high encouragement," &c.

But Dr. Codman's report from "foreign countries" was rather a *cooler* on this self-complacent ardour. The doctor had been a delegate, &c. "He entertained great doubts whether the Temperance reform had made such progress in *foreign coun-*

tries, &c. He had enjoyed some opportunities of personal observation . . . . . and, from what he had seen and heard while in England, it was his opinion that the progress of this reform was by no means so great as was supposed and represented," &c.

But *facts* were not what was wanted, but something to kindle up the oratory of such a man as Dr. Beecher, who, yielding all credence to the flattering letters of "foreign correspondents," exclaimed, "England is coming; France is coming; Europe is coming; the world is coming." Where? In our wake. But Dr. Codman, who had been to see, reports, "Nay, gentlemen, it is a mistake—no such thing."—"But, good doctor, we don't want the truth. We want something that will answer our purpose. See how our brother, Dr. Beecher, kindles up! Do you imagine he could have made that soul-thrilling speech if he had known the truth?" And this, it may be, will be stereotyped in the next edition of *Facts*: "England is coming," &c. But alas! we fear England will be a long time coming over to total abstinence. Nothing much like it yet. So says Dr. Codman; and so say all who know.

We shall be curious to see whether the book of Facts contains Dr. Mussey's four cases of rather enormous eating. 1. The supper for four men, and a nine pound ham, all devoured by one, and at one sitting. 2. Eight rabbits in one man's stomach at a time. 3. One sheep in another's. 4. One hog

in another's; and so on. These are rather large, as must be confessed. Nevertheless, *if* they actually went down with the eaters, there is no good reason why they should not go down with us. But we forget that the Temperance Society has not yet taken up the business of eating; they only attend to the drinking. Dr. Mussey can tell them, that "if much poison does much harm, a little poison does a little harm;" and that oil of vitriol will corrode a watch. Ergo, the smallest particle of alcohol, diffused in a glass of wine, will poison a man. If a man's blood, after having drunk a gallon of gin, will burn blue, ergo, the blood of a man who has drunk a glass of wine will also take fire. There will doubtless be a chapter of spontaneous combustions. That would be exceedingly entertaining, and would make an impression. If a single drop of alcohol would not kill a man, it might drown a flea; and that would prove that it is destructive to animal life—a poison.

Since the times of Copernicus, Galileo, Bacon, and Newton, the philosophy of common sense has been extending its domain. The "Instauration of the Sciences" set up "the father of experimental philosophy," and generally men have prided themselves in following his steps.

But, obviously, a new era seems to have commenced nine years ago, and the world has been travelling [advancing] backward. It is not now the philosophy of fact, but the fact of philosophy—that is to say—the fact generated by philosophy—alias,

by theory—alias, by the will. As publicly and officially stated at Saratoga in 1836, it was resolved, at the organization of the Temperance Society in 1827, "It is not right," &c. Before they had entered upon their labours, the great principle was fixed; and "the *object*" since has been to *prove* it by such a collection of facts, so shaped and bent, "as to produce universally the conviction," &c. And here is the book of 450 pages, "to be put into the hands of every clergyman, teacher, and statesman, in every country of the world;"—facts got up to establish a principle confessedly determined *beforehand*. "The object" was not to wait and see where facts would lead them, and to adopt such principles as facts should develop; but to collect and arrange such facts and opinions as would support the original position: "It is not right." We hardly need say, that facts and opinions can be manufactured with the greatest facility in these times, and are always in the market, to suit all buyers and all tastes. Neither will they be disputed, so long as they carry upon their face their own refutation with sober and discerning minds. Men know that they can be better employed. We mean not by this to impeach the entire budget of facts bound up by the Temperance Society; far from it. We believe many of them are important, and may be useful; but they seem not yet to have been of "a sufficient number and *variety* to produce *universally* the entire conviction *among men of sound*

mind, that to use intoxicating drink of *any* description *is not right*;" unless it can be shown that Professor Potter and men of his stamp are not of "sound mind." We have not yet seen the book. We only judge from the specimens usually afloat in the Temperance papers, tracts, and books, which doubtless contain "the gist of the argument." The naked facts are valuable; though all men may not arrive at the same conclusion. A vast many of these said facts, however, have in, and about, and upon them so much of the dress and airs of fiction, that sober men will receive them with caution. They are to be sifted.

"Among men of sound mind." It is astonishing what assurance, not to say impudence, these men are stocked with and are able to show off. They are self-defended at all points; they have put the seal upon the lips of all opponents. If a man dissents, he is *de facto* classed by them in one of two categories: either he is not a man of "sound mind," or else he is interested. This is rather uncivil. But as the decision has now come *ex cathedrâ*, wo be to him that shall have the temerity to lift his voice against it! It has been nine years under mask, *confessedly*, while the machinery to support it has been in a course of preparation. Now the battery is opened, and the matches are swinging and smoking in the air. Hot work there must be soon, if we may judge from the militant language used at Saratoga. For example, in a single speech, which would not oc-

cupy more than two of these pages, we have staring us in the face "enemy" six times; "main body" three times; "fight" ditto; "troops" twice; "banner" ditto; with other such sprinklings of military phrase, as "attacked," "van," "power," "point of the bayonet," "put to flight," "run away," "auxiliaries," "driven off the field," "beaten," "battle," "conquered," "triumph," "aggressive movement," "line of movement," "canteens," &c. In about half the same space we have again "cowardice" three times; "advance one point" twice; "carrying points" ditto; "ranks," "shoulder to shoulder," "territory of the enemy," "reconnoitre," "encamp," "attacking all points," "*slam bang*," &c.

Some of these gentlemen are so addicted to the sounding of alarms, as to seem to act in this office under a mechanical necessity. What time they do not stand on the crater edge of a volcano, crying to all the world—"The mountain rocks, the earth heaves, and the pent-up fires within are ready to pour forth their torrents of burning lava," they are on the plains below, drilling and sham-fighting with their troops. War, or some dire convulsion, they seem resolved to have. Long may they live, and die before it comes.

Surely, it was rather a piece of—what shall we say?—affectation, or nervous apprehension—for the chief Secretary of the American Temperance Society to say, "In the course of the discussion [of

the Convention], allusion had been made, no doubt with the kindest intentions, to the name [the secretary's] of one of the members of that committee [which brought in the resolutions]. He regretted this, and hoped it would not be repeated." Better to have let that very natural and innocent blunder have its own way, than to express anxiety about it. The secretary had been complimented for his wisdom, prudence, &c., and it had been urged, that the fact of the resolutions having been drawn up by him—and thoroughly conned, as they must have been—was a sufficient voucher for their form and substance; and that no amendment ought, on that account, to be proposed. They had passed formally through the hands of a committee, who, of course, in reporting and recommending them, had assumed the responsibility. It was the former of the two resolutions which have been under consideration that was urged to be passed on the credit of such authorship. The reason assigned, however, was equally applicable to both, and to all. "This resolution," said the speaker, "is not the extemporaneous product of a heated mind. It was penned, I believe, by —— [the chief secretary]. ..... We all know his character—that it is far from being marked with precipitancy. If he has any fault, it is that of being too cautious. He has pondered long on this subject, and has brought in this resolution in such a form as he approves," &c. Why betray anxiety at such an imputation? Everybody knew that the passing of this budget of reso-

lutions through the hands of a committee was a mere matter of form. Doubtless, however, there was counsel in their getting up. We suppose the compliment paid to the secretary, as to ability and prudence, was just. But the division of responsibility, in such a case, is economical, especially when it is likely to be considerable. No wonder that the secretary felt uneasy. The measures proposed and pending were a bold and daring push:—They struck at the root and heart—went into the very soul—of the most cherished feelings of the great body of the wide community—of their feelings of self-respect, and of their attachment to the rights of conscience and of private judgment. Guarded and subtle as they are, they involve the sentence of proscription, in social standing, against the wisest, best, greatest, and most influential men in the land. So it was understood by both parties in the Convention; and so it has since been claimed by one of the leading organs, the Monthly Journal of the Temperance Society:—"It will be perceived that the Convention have fully recognised the principle, &c., on the ground of MORAL obligation." And more than this:—These measures have aimed a blow at one of the positive institutions of Christianity; and it was openly avowed, that a disturbance of the ordinance established in commemoration of the Saviour's death, as held and observed by Christians of all ages, was not only contemplated, but resolved on! Let the reader turn back to the conclusion of Professor Potter's

last speech, as quoted in these pages, and he will see how these doings were understood by him.

We have it, then, officially confessed, in 1836, that this radical principle has been aimed at for years; and that all the labours of the American Temperance Society, since its organization, have been contrived and sustained for this end.

Since, then, the American public have this development of design, in a numerous and powerful combination of individuals, reduced to form by their own hand, solemnly enacted into a plan of social and public reform, it will be seen whether the author of these pages has laboured under a false and groundless impression as to the existence of an extensive and organized scheme for the establishment of a spiritual supremacy over the mind of this country.

Is that the very and specific design? And how is the motive apparent? No: such was not originally, nor is it now generally, the design. For the most part, these reforming measures have originated in the best of motives; and, for the most part, they are now sustained by the best of motives. But the question is—What have they already come to? And whither are they tending? We have seen that they have come to an *invasion* of the sacred rights of conscience and of private judgment; that they have entered the sanctuary of private life with the airs and tones of authority; that they have decreed rules for the action and bearings

of the moral sense of the community and of individuals; and that they have publicly and solemnly enacted a sentence of general proscription against all who shall henceforth presume to dissent from their authoritative decisions. "Private judgment," says the author of the Natural History of Enthusiasm, "cannot be invaded without crushing the human mind, and substituting the chains of despotism for the bond of peace and love."

Spiritual power was never yet aimed at, and never gained, except under specious pretexts. And what more specious than the present Temperance reformation? It had every advantage to give it a leading influence to such an end—advantages calculated to delude not only the public, but the principal agents themselves. It may be admitted—we believe—that this combination originated in the purpose of gaining an ascendency over the public mind for a good end; and that the ultimate aim of an authoritative sway, which, as appears, has been so long cherished, was also intended for good. It was thought and believed by these men, as we charitably suppose, that they could manage this business safely and for public good. Generally it has been conducted under the guise of enlightening the public mind, and forming a public opinion on a specific, known, and acknowledged evil. Thus far proper and good.

But the Temperance pledge—the merits of which have been discussed in a former chapter—has been the key to the mischief that has followed

and is in progress. It sets up the right of prying into our neighbour's private affairs, and of an inquisitorial inspection over his private conduct. It erects a court over his conscience, and entitles to prescribe authoritatively to his judgment. The public have been invaded by this usurpation, and have extensively yielded to it, before they suspected its character or could be aware of its tendencies. When once the prying eye and usurping tread of impertinence have obtained access within the sacred precincts of our domestic retreats, and dragged out the secrets of our closets to public view, it is not only less easy to eject the intruder than to have barred the door against him, but he considers himself entitled to that as a right, which he gained by stealth and violence. Besides, we are in his power.

So has it been with the Temperance pledge: It has extensively forced the public, first, into the endurance, and next, into the recognition, of a gross impropriety—into a practice not healthful in the social state, and unfavourable to good morals. This invasion and triumph have proved the breaking down of the wall. The enemy, being in possession, had only to choose what dwellings he would enter, and what temples he would desecrate and profane. One usurpation over conscience prepared the way for any and for every other. A public, long used to the pledge, and yielding to it, might be expected to make little resistance to any other proposal of the same character. An organized system

of spiritual supremacy begins with trifling demands; marches to power by degrees; and comes at last to an uncontrolled sway, with as little compunction as if it were only appropriating its birthright prerogatives. It may even be unconscious of its trespasses. There may have been no evil design in the evil work. Every stage of progress may have been so corrupting and blinding in its influence on the aggressors, that they may think they are "doing God service," and promoting the highest good of man.

So, doubtless, the Temperance reformers have thought. The device of the pledge was a natural product—a mere ramification—of an artificial state of society. that has prevailed to some extent in the religious world, in the plan of mutual guardianship; and so long as it was confined to those who like it, the evil was fenced up in its native enclosures. But the moment they undertook to impose it upon all the world, it became a trespass. The cause, however, was launched on a popular current; it ran on with acclamation; this mischievous and fatal ingredient, though felt extensively to be unwholesome, was yet so mixed with the flood as not materially to disturb the waters or arrest the movement. It was in, however, and must work its way, as a radical, vital, all-pervading element, leavening the entire lump.

The leading and most influential Temperance reformers have always sympathized with this sentiment; they have cultivated and cherished it; they

have worked by it; till it has become the principal instrument in their hands—till the public are inured to it, and have almost ceased to remonstrate.

The progress of this imperceptible stealth prepared the way for the grand push which was made at Saratoga. It was hoped, and probably believed, that the community were ready for it; that a gag-law might now be thrust into the mouths of all opponents, effectually and for ever to silence them. This final enactment is a mere carrying out of the previous course—the consummation of the principle of the pledge scheme. It only shows how a community may be led on from one stage to another in a course of spiritual subjugation, unaware of the progress, till they are on the eve of a complete and irretrievable inthralment—till the seal is set to their doom, unless, peradventure, their eyes being opened, they shall rise to break their chains, and resolve to be free.

When this subject was up in a former chapter, it was suggested that the Temperance reformation is the grand experiment; but little did we think that the experiment would make its grand development before these pages should be drawn to a close. We are not prepared to bring it in charge that a spiritual supremacy has been specifically and professedly resolved on *in council*. We do not believe it has, under this name; nor do we think that the aim has been in itself morally evil, in the minds of those who have concerted and carried it forward. It has always passed under

the name of an effort to enlighten the public mind, and to form public opinion—a plausible pretence, calculated to blind the eyes both of the agents and of the public. Nevertheless, it was another name for an attempt to *control* public opinion. It was, indeed, such an attempt, confessedly. And the history of that attempt is before us. Whatever may have been the purpose, the result is—the attainment of a spiritual power, vested in the hands of a combination of individuals, under the garb of a reforming society, that has dared to form and publish an edict, first, declaring all those who dissent from them incompetent to sit in judgment on the question at issue between them and the public; and next, passing on all such dissidents a sentence of condemnation and denunciation, calculated, if not designed, to destroy their standing and influence in society, so far as this decree may obtain credit, and be acknowledged as authority. Not presuming to pronounce on the moral character of this transaction, as to its designs in the hearts of its originators and supporters, we nevertheless doubt whether there can be found the copy of a papal bull on the shelves of the Vatican at Rome of a bolder and higher character.

Let it be observed, the result of this experiment comes to this:—That if the public mind can be once thoroughly subjugated to the Temperance Society prescriptions and proscriptions, as they now stand; if the consciences and judgments of all classes can once be brought under these rules,

and enforced to quail before these denunciations; if the Temperance catechists may enter every house and every closet, and make catechumens of every man, woman, and child, on their present avowed principles, then will there no longer remain a barrier against their encroachments, in any form of religion or of morals, which they may choose to adopt as a law for the community, or against any decree of proscription which they shall think fit to enact. This gained—all is gained; and an absolute spiritual supremacy may reign triumphant.

Professor Potter said he had been reminded, "That there might be some drunkard present who was wavering in his decision, and whom he might determine to the side of inebriety. The suggestion, I admit," said he, "is most painful, and has often kept me silent when I wished to raise my voice against what I was convinced was wrong. *But no success can be permanent except that which is founded on truth.*..... There is a fruit which is fair to the eye, and ashes to the lips..... We see measures warmly pressed which we believe calculated to injure, if not to arrest, the progress of Temperance reform. Must we for ever shut our lips, lest some unhappy drunkard should misconstrue what we say? Oh, sir, let us cling to the truth. Let us pursue an honest, straightforward policy. Be assured of it, we never shall triumph on any other ground."

The author has weighed the responsibility of "clinging to the truth—of pursuing an honest, straight-forward policy," against all the possible abuses that may result from it. Shall these Temperance reformers be permitted to come to such a pass, and then to turn and say to their opponents, who have been filled with alarm, and roused to resist such daring encroachments, "Hush, gentlemen; you will do mischief by this interference; there is a drunkard yonder who will take encouragement by your stand?" Admitting there are ten thousand to be thus affected by it, on whom does the responsibility rest? Every honest man's feeling has determined this question before it could be asked; and responds to it when put, as if insulted by the appeal. "Oh, sirs, let us cling to the truth." The rights of the community have been invaded: the rights of conscience and of private judgment. The sacraments of our holy religion are being disturbed and broken up! An authoritative sentence of proscription, against honest minds and pure hearts, has gone forth over the length and breadth of the land! And will they who have done this say the responsibility of the evils that may result from an honest and earnest effort to buffet and bring down this usurpation, rests on the aggrieved assertors and defenders of their own rights? Who were responsible for the blood that was shed, for the treasures that were exhausted, and for the injury done to public morals, in the war that asserted and purchased our

national independence? The patriots of the revolution?

"The world's fate depends on our success;" .... "Earth's destiny hangs on this cause" .... said one of the speakers at Saratoga. So says the "Moral Reform Society" of New-York, the direct tendency of whose labours, in the shape they have assumed, is to multiply inducements to crime, and thus to aggravate the evils they are designed to remove. And so says the rider of every reforming hobby, when once he is fairly mounted. We cannot allow ourselves to be carried away by such extravagance. We do not believe that "the world's fate" or "earth's destiny" hangs on the Temperance Society, or any other society, or all of them put together. So long as they do well we will support them; when they do badly we shall abandon and expose them, if we think proper, without fear of the responsibility, and without any apprehensions that the world will be ruined, or the community suffer damage in consequence, even if our effort prevails. We have given reasons in these pages to show that society and Christianity rest on too firm a basis to be materially affected by such accidents.

We have arrived in this country to an anomalous state of society, when our only alternatives are to come under a spiritual despotism, or run some risk in breaking loose from the chains that are held over our necks. It is the choice of evils. Had not the author seen reasons to believe, and

had he not been able in the progress of these pages to show, that Christianity is firmly and thoroughly established in the good opinion and affections of the wide community, beyond the possibility of being disturbed by the irruptions of infidelity and licentiousness, he would have been dismayed at the prospect before us. That the public generally should ultimately acquiesce in and submit to these indiscreet, overstrained, and compulsory measures of reform, which constrain conscience and forestall the prerogative of opinion, can hardly be supposed. It would be travelling back to the dark ages. And yet this combined effort has stolen such a march, and gained such an ascendency, that an attempt to be disengaged from its sway would seem at first sight to impose the difficult and dubious problem—How to escape disadvantage and disaster?—How, in veering from the rock of Scylla, to avoid being drawn into the vortex of Charybdis? The temper of our community is impetuous; and it will be said, that to withdraw restraint is to let them go unbridled to ruin. The answer to this is, that unreasonable, intolerable restraint withdrawn is safer than such restraint held on till it be thrown off by the violence of passion. If the things subjected to criticism in these pages can be sustained and endured in their specific forms, then has the author entirely mistaken both the temper of the public and the genius of Christianity; and he will not be unwilling to be convicted of the error. But his persuasion on this

point is firm: he does not believe that such invasions of conscience and of judgment can be carried. In the light in which they stand before him, he could never desire it. He has been constrained to view them as an organized system for the attainment of a spiritual supremacy—at least as having that tendency. The facts alluded to, and others disclosed in this work, present a leading and grand development of this aim, which, the author thinks, can no longer be disguised.

It is the consolation of the Christian, that God governs the world. The errors of the best of men cannot now detract materially from the respect lodged in the public mind for the Bible and for the institutions of Christianity. The extravagant and compulsory measures of indiscreet reformers will be appreciated; and the hopes of the great public will still revert to and rest upon the catholic and cardinal principles of Divine Revelation. Infidelity may yet feed and nourish itself on the foibles of professed religionists; licentiousness may rave; but the foundations of truth are firm, and cannot be shaken.

The only hope of our country and of the world is a reformation on the basis of truth—of truth laid before the mind, and left on the conscience, to do its own work unembarrassed. When a reformer attempts to lay *his* hand upon the conscience, and bind it in chains by prescripts of his own invention, he transcends his prerogative, and invades the province of Jehovah.

NOTE TO CHAPTER IV.

In the Christian Spectator for September, 1836, under a review entitled—"*Injurious effects of popular works on* [*the subject of?*] *health*," is the following extract, credited to a "learned and judicious medical writer:"—

"On the whole, after a very attentive consideration of the subject, I am strongly inclined to believe that the *popular treatises on diet and regimen*, the habitual lecturing of students upon their health, and the *newspaper recommendations and prescriptions of food and drink*, have been the *cause* of *ten* cases of dyspepsy in the place of *one* which they have prevented or removed. It is said that no susceptible person can fix his attention upon his heart for five minutes at a time without producing pain or distress, or varying the action of that vital organ. The same is probably the fact with the stomach..... A *regular habit* of using the bounties of Providence with *temperance* and *moderation*, is *about all* that can be enforced upon the public to *advantage*. All *popular directions, besides the rules of common sense and common prudence*, are liable to be misunderstood

and perverted, *and to be carried to extremes*, which render them *worse* than useless—*increasing the evils* which they were benevolently, but *injudiciously*, designed to diminish."

We know not who this "learned and judicious medical writer" is; but it is manifest that he had his eye upon the system of Temperance quackery, now so extensively prevalent. He could not mean any thing else. He has not only come up to our own statement, that the Temperance reformation has killed more than it has cured, but he has gone far beyond us, and put it "*ten* to *one*."

It is remarkable that the whole community—or that part which is yet *sober*, not *intoxicated* with the Temperance mania—are getting awake to this great and growing evil. Even the Christian Spectator, in the article referred to, will be likely to astound the Abstinents with its boldness. It has not ventured, indeed, to attack the Temperance Society, except under *cover;* but there can be no doubt of its *aim*. Take, for example, the following extracts:—"The second bad effect of popular teachings on health, has been the adoption of *vicious* and *visionary* plans of living, *to the entire neglect of common sense and the instructive voice of the organs*—an effect which would have been *far more disastrous than it is*, had it been possible to cause these plans to be generally embraced. The truth is, the great majority of those who are in good health, who have been *accustomed to depend on the impulses of nature* for guidance, and

who have no reason to suppose their appetites to be perverted or false, cannot be persuaded to practise the austerities of *ascetics* and *schemers*. They will not consent to wear the harness of invalids; to be *cramped* and *shackled by rules* which they do not understand, and which they *feel* that they do not *need;* to be governed by *precise* formulæ of *other* men's *inventions* in such vulgar matters as eating and *drinking; and it is well that they will not*..... Just so far as this excitement has pervaded the classes in question [common people and labourers], and occasioned the substitution of *prescribed* forms for natural impulses and native good sense, just so far it has *multiplied* the '*pale faces*.'..... If that voice [of natural appetite] is to be disregarded—if it is to be stifled and scouted as the voice of a demon urging to destruction—and a set of silly rules, invented by *visionaries*, and followed by *fools*, to be substituted in its place and clothed with its authority,—we say, alas! for poor, helpless, hapless, fallen man!..... If appetite unperverted cannot be trusted, &c.—if it is not allowed to be judge in those things which lie within its own assigned sphere of jurisdiction, we defy the advocates of rules and standards to say in what case it ought to be trusted. The instinct which regulates breathing is no better, &c..... There is no inconsiderable class, the studious, the sedentary, the nervous, the irritable, those of shattered health, and half-shattered minds, who are for ever the dupes of *fanaticism*

and *imposture;* who are always running after *charlatans* and *mountebanks*, &c..... The idea of eating and *drinking*, sleeping and waking, thinking and breathing, after some prime recipe, suits their notion exactly, &c..... We regard the rules concerning diet, and many *other* matters relating to hygiene, as entirely superfluous and ineffectual in the healthy, and as practically useless in the valetudinary, &c..... We are not the advocates of intemperate eating any more than we are of *intemperate* [?] drinking; but neither are we the defenders of *suicidal asceticism* and *monkish self-denial.* We *believe our appetites were given us to be indulged*, and indulged to the *extent of their demands*, when unperverted; and wo to that man who renounces their guidance, or who would root them out as noxious weeds and superfluous monitors. They were planted within us by the same hand that fashioned our bodies, endowed the soul, and gave existence to worlds. They were given for wise and benevolent ends, and as an essential part of the economy of living systems. They are the *lights within us*, placed there to guide us in those matters which reason is incompetent to regulate; and he who would extinguish or disregard them on the plea that science, so called, has discovered surer and better lights, will find, sooner or later, that he has dreamed—he has put out his eyes, that he might the better see."

Verily, what but the extravagances and mischiefs of the Temperance quackery could have

roused such a spirit, and endited such doctrine, in such a quarter! We are amazed! Had we dared to originate such heresy in these pages, we might, peradventure, have been caught looking over both shoulders, one after the other, in rapid succession, to see if the ghosts of the Inquisition were not making way through the keyhole of the door or the crevices of the wall, to detect and report our misdeeds even before we had risen from our table. It is astonishing how great errors will rouse great minds, and bring them out; how truth will leap as from the marble, or spring as from the canvass, when her more quiet and monumental repose has been insulted! Appetite a guide?! Come, ye Temperance reformers, to the field! There is work for you now. Ye have conjured up spirits which ye did not dream of. March to New-Haven, the cradle of all heresies, and ye shall have enough for a while to be occupied withal. Nevertheless, there is not only spirit, but some stout argument in that assay. There are principles asserted and defended in it which not only convict the Temperance Society of being a "superfluity of naughtiness," but a public nuisance.

THE END.

Date Due

Library Bureau Cat. no. 1137

BX
4817
P967 19698
AUTHOR
Protestant (A)
TITLE
Protestant Jesuitism

DATE LOANED	BORROWER'S NAME	DATE RETURNED